

CREATIVE CONTROVERSIES IN
CHRISTIANITY

Creative Controversies in Christianity

By

GEORGE W. RICHARDS, D.D., LL.D., D.Th. 1269-

*President and Professor of Church History, Theological
Seminary, Evangelical and Reformed
Church, Lancaster, Pa.*



NEW YORK
Fleming H. Revell Company
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXXXVIII by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

All rights reserved: no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from the Publisher, except by a reviewer desiring to quote brief passages for inclusion in a notice to be inserted in a newspaper or periodical.

33-13643

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
London: 21 Paternoster Square

To
William, Mary, Martha

333459

THE JAMES SPRUNT LECTURES

In 1911, Mr. James Sprunt, of Wilmington, North Carolina, established a perpetual lectureship at Union Theological Seminary, which would enable the institution to secure from time to time the services of distinguished ministers and authoritative scholars as special lecturers on subjects connected with various departments of Christian thought and Christian work. The lecturers are chosen by the Faculty of the Seminary and a committee of the Board of Trustees, and the lectures are published after their delivery in accordance with a contract between the lecturer and these representatives of the Institution. The series of lectures on this foundation for the year 1938 is presented in this volume.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
Creative Equivalent to Clarifying	10
Salvation the Supreme Issue	12
Qualitative Kinship between God and Man	13
I. PHILOSOPHER AND PROPHET	17
Socrates and Amos	17
Things in Common	18
Things Distinctive in Socrates	22
<i>Preparatio Evangelica</i>	27
Amos a Turning-point in Prophecy	28
Things Distinctive in Amos	32
II. JESUS	42
The Carpenter	42
Preaching	44
Opinions about Him	45
The Christ, Lord, Logos	47
His Message in Messianic Terms	48
How We May Know Him	50
Love Incarnate	52
In Controversy with His World, in the Desert, in Palestine	54
The Eternal Sin	57
Positive Christianity	59
Conquering Love	65
III. SAUL, WHO WAS ALSO CALLED PAUL	67
The Man	67
Paul and Stephen	72
His Conversion	74
Controversies: Perils from My Race; Perils from My Brethren; Perils from the Gentiles	79
Paul in Our Age	94
IV. THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ACTION AND IN DEFINITION	97
The Spirit and Modern Philosophy and Theology	97
The Spirit and the Universe, Nature, and History	100

	The Spirit in the Old Testament	104
	The Spirit in the New Testament	107
	The Spirit and the Mind of Christ	111
	Sporadic or Intermittent Action	115
	Permanent Presence and Guidance	116
	Tests of the Spirit	118
	Doctrine of the Spirit: Apostolic Fathers, Baptismal Confession of Rome	123
V.	QUEST FOR A CHRISTIAN METAPHYSIC	126
	Need of a Christian Metaphysic	127
	Jesus, Man and God	127
	Jewish-Christian Christology	130
	Christology of Paul	133
	Greek View of Redemption	138
	Corresponding Christology	142
	Significance of Arian Controversy	147
	Nicene Creed and Its Meaning Today . . .	149
VI.	THE MIDDLE AGE—WHEN? WHY? WHAT? . .	157
	Estimates of Middle Age	157
	Limits of Middle Age of Church History, Political History, History of Literature, History of Medieval Thought	159
	A Period of Transition	160
	Relation of Middle Age to the Ancient Age, to the Modern Age	162
	From Tribal Chaos to National Cosmos . .	168
	Controlling Principles in Beginning of Middle Age: Catholicity and Uniformity; at the End: Individualism and Diversity	171
	Renaissance and Reformation	182
	What Next?	186
VII.	SCHLEIERMACHER AND BARTH	187
	Continuity and Discontinuity; an Historical Approach	187
	Erasmus and Luther	189
	Hegel and Kierkegaard	197
	Schleiermacher and Barth	205
	Return to Paul and the Epistle to the Romans .	213

INTRODUCTION

When President Lacy informed me that the Board of Trustees of Union Seminary had chosen me to be the Sprunt Lecturer for the year 1938, he suggested that I prepare a series of semi-popular lectures on the history of Christian thought or of Christian work. He was more than generous in allowing me a subject of vast scope—in time covering nineteen centuries, in space including all the races and churches of the hemispheres. After reflection, I concluded that such an assignment was more easily made than met. One is perplexed by the mass of material and by the almost endless topics which one may select—all of them to be discussed in seven periods of an hour each. In attempting the semi-popular there lurk two dangers, heaviness on the one hand and lightness on the other. To be semi-popular one must steer clear of the Scylla of popularity and of the Charybdis of unpopularity.

Mindful of Goethe's words, *In der Beschränkung liegt des Meisters Kraft*, "Limitation is the strength of the master," I finally selected the theme *Creative Controversies in Christianity*. I hesitated, however, between the adjectives "creative" and "clarifying." The former has the vogue at present. Much is said and written on creative thinking, creative living, creative chemistry, creative teaching, and various other creative disciplines and actions. The term is indicative of the humanistic trend of today, of the consciousness of man's ability to work out his destiny.

I hesitated because I have been accustomed to at-

tribute creative power to God alone.¹ Man does not create; he formulates, develops, cultivates, defines, what God creates. God created the garden, but man was to dress it and to keep it. Man gave names to every living creature, but he created none of them. God admonished man to replenish and subdue the earth, to have dominion over the fish of the sea and the birds of the heavens. Thomas Aquinas writes of a world of created causes, and since they are created they cannot create.² Man, accordingly, is co-worker, but not co-creator, with God.

God gives men germs, not gems; seed and soil, not trees and fruit; dynamic relations, not finished information. Truth is like the grain of wheat or the acorn. The golden harvest is latent in the one and the forests of oak in the other. But what is latent can become patent only through the plow, the sowing, and the soil, or through planting, cultivation, and the care of the farmer or the forester. The impact of reality upon the mind, whether mediately through the senses or immediately through the soul, starts a process by which the invisible becomes visible, the infinite and the eternal become finite and temporal, the generic and the vague become specific and clear.

Taken in this sense the word creative is equivalent to the word clarifying. Creative controversies are at the same time clarifying. For what God creates and freely gives, man must achieve before it becomes his own. The prophet can proclaim only what he sees; the philosopher can define only what he finds.

The way to clarity usually is through opposition, controversy, strife. Heraclitus said: "All things take

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 16.

place through strife and necessity." . . . "Opposition unites." . . . "From what draws apart results the most beautiful harmony." . . . "War is father of all and king of all."³ Socrates said, "The god compels me to be a midwife but forbids me to bring forth."⁴ Homer, therefore, is assumed to have erred when he said, "Would that strife might perish from among gods and men." Herodotus wrote his History to exhibit the clash of the opposing moral ideals of Asia and of Europe. Asia meant Persia, the creation of Cyrus, and Europe meant Greece and its colonies. The Father of History depicts the possibility of choice between abject submission to an autocrat and free obedience to law made by equals.⁵

One greater and later than Heraclitus or Herodotus announced that He "came to bring not peace but a sword." He suited His action to His word. For wherever He went He precipitated controversy; and wherever His disciples went and were true to their Master they turned the world upside down. The prophets who came before Him worked their visions into life through stress, suffering, pain, and travail, "that through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope." Paul wrote to the Corinthians: "There must be also factions among you that they that are approved may be made manifest among you" (I Cor. 11:19).

Professor Paul Tillich defines history as the conflict of two opposing principles; "truth itself dwells in the midst of struggle and fate, not in an immobile beyond, as Plato would have it."⁶ Indeed, history is a war of ideals. There is war on earth because there is war in heaven. The battles of men are the conflicts of the gods projected into time and space.

Controversies in Christianity were inevitable if it was to become a vital part of the historical process and to accomplish God's purpose in men and nations. Of course there were destructive as well as creative, obscuring as well as clarifying, factors in Christian controversies. The antagonists raised so much dust that they could not see the light, stirred up so much hatred that they became blind and deaf to truth and love.

The supreme issue is salvation—the deliverance of men from ignorance into wisdom, from bondage into freedom, from death into life. That is the controlling motive and the final goal of all history; otherwise history is merely cyclic recurrence without the purpose of a far-off divine event. Even in times of chaos, when nations rise against nations; when upon the earth there is distress of nations in perplexity; when the sea and the billows roar; when men faint for expectation of the things which are coming on the world; when the powers of the heavens are shaken; then we shall look up, lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh.

In simple phrase, all controversies in Christianity that have been worth while have been waged around questions like the following: Whence are we? What and why are we? How are we to become what we ought to be? What must we do to be saved? What think ye of Christ? Where are we going? What are the new heavens and the new earth in which dwelleth righteousness? Perhaps the greatest of all questions is this: "If a man die, shall he live again?" To be or not to be, that is the question. It is the greatest because its answer gives meaning to the life of the individual and of humanity from its beginning in the dim past to its end in the unknown future.

The ground for controversy among Christians, and

between Christians and the adherents of religions and philosophies, is in the nature of God and of man. God is essentially human and man is essentially divine (Gen. 1:27). True, God is God and man is man; but God is at the same time Father and man is child. Kierkegaard reiterates the qualitative difference between God and man, between eternity and time. Barth accepts this thesis as fundamental and controlling in his interpretation of Christianity and the Bible. Since these men have revived the use of paradox, we venture—without denying the qualitative difference between God and man—to affirm the qualitative kinship between God and man. Both theses are presuppositions for the redemptive activity of God. Without both, the incarnation would lose its meaning and value; there could be no Fatherhood and sonship. "Because ye are sons, God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father!" Without both, the parable of the Prodigal Son would be unthinkable. If "my flesh" were not "in the Godhead," the Godhead could not dwell in me.

The original fellowship between God and man was disrupted but not lost when man deliberately put his own will and purpose in place of God's will and purpose, made himself, instead of God, the centre of the cosmos. "And ye shall be as God" (or "gods," Gen. 3:5). When man was beguiled by that promise, God apparently became inhuman (Gen. 3:14-20) and man apparently became godless. Love turned into wrath, and trust into fear. God and man were estranged and the whole creation was affected by the estrangement (Rom. 8:20-22). The sense of evil and of the inadequacy and frustration of human effort prevailed. Evil became personal sin and guilt when man deliberately

refused to heed God's call to the divine way of life. In reality God remained Father and man remained child, each seeking the other.

Here, then, is the ultimate cause of the cosmic and the human tragedy which is the *leit motif* of ancient and modern drama, of music, of painting, of sculpture, and of architecture. The arts are an attempt to set forth in sound, colour, and lines what Paul wrote to the Romans: I do not act as I want to act; on the contrary, I do what I detest (7:15); or what Faust says:

*Zwei Seelen wohnen ach in meiner Brust;
Die eine will sich von der anderen trennen.*

Religion in its lowest and its highest forms is man's endeavour to find, to please, to appease, the power, the persons or person who are the origin, the support, and the meaning of his life. It is the feeling after God in whom men live and move and have their being (Acts 17:27, 28). It is a natural part of the human process from naïve savagery to scientific enlightenment, of the gradual passing from fetishism to sun-worship and man-worship; but it never reaches the well of water which when men drink they will never thirst again (John 4:14). In other words, the human striving is within the scope of the relative, while man is never at rest or peace until he lives in communion with the absolute—until the prodigal returns to the Father's house.

The last act in the cosmic and human tragedy, the denouement, is reached not by man's finding God but by God's finding man, when the essentially human in God and the essentially divine in man become visible and tangible facts in a historical person. When man deliberately separated from God, God alone could

bridge the gulf through His approach to man in Jesus Christ. "He brake down the middle wall of partition" (Eph. 2:14). In Him the meaning of the cosmic and the historical process, of history, of human life, individual and social, becomes clear: it is the struggle of the human in God toward man and the striving of the divine in man toward God.

In this struggle God is rebuffed again and again, but He never ceases to seek man, to go after the lost sheep until He find it. Man boasts of his ability to live without God, of his self-sufficiency, but eventually he comes to himself and goes to the Father. Here he finds the love that would not let him go, that gave Himself on Calvary that he might find the Father. Thus God and man dwell in peace together by a creative act of God—not by education, culture, evolution, but by virgin birth, a term which connotes far more than a physical act: it contains the essence of the mystery of the redemptive power and love of God.

In this battle of the ages, this conflict of eternity and time, the humanity of God at times overcomes the ungodliness of man. Again, the ungodliness of man is blinded to the humanity of God. Even when the Word became flesh men could not see or hear Him; His own received Him not. "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God" (John 1:12). Some day, in God's way, "every created thing which is in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth and on the sea, and all things that are in them" will say: "Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the dominion, for ever and ever" (Rev. 5:13). This is the finale of the creative, providing, and redeeming activity of God.

While we accept in faith this original hope of the Christians, the transfiguration of heaven and earth by the hand of the Lord, "it does not affect the necessity we are under of admitting that until that transformation all in history can and must be wrought out in human fashion. For in the God-manhood is included the whole fulness of manhood with its freedom and creativity."⁷

FOOTNOTES

¹ See Nicholas Berdyaev, *The Destiny of Man* (New York, Scribner, 1937), pp. 162-170, "The Nature of Creativeness."

² Etienne Gilson, *St. Thomas Aquinas* (Oxford University Press, 1935).

³ Quoted in T. V. Smith, *Philosophers Speak for Themselves* (University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 11.

⁴ Plato, *Theætetus* 150 (Jowett's translation).

⁵ Herodotus I.4.

⁶ *Interpretation of History* (New York, Scribner, 1936), p. 5.

⁷ Sergius Bulgakov, *The Wisdom of God* (London, Williams & Norgate, 1937), p. 209.

I

PHILOSOPHER AND PROPHET

SOCRATES AND AMOS

"For there must be also factions among you, that they that are approved [genuine Christians, Moffatt translation] may be made manifest among you."—I CORINTHIANS 11:19.

In this chapter I shall consider the Philosopher and the Prophet—Socrates in Greece, Amos in Palestine. Each was both an historical person and the symbol of a species; the end of an old and the beginning of a new era; the death of gods and the birth of gods. Each had his distinctive method and mission and has played a major or a minor part in the Christian controversies through the ages. To quote Berdyaev: "The formation of man as an integral being, as a personality, that process which began in the world of the Bible and the Greek world, was finished only in Christianity." Socrates and Amos had two things in common, God and the good life. They spent their lives in persuading men, in the words of Socrates, "to give their first care to the perfection of their souls"; and, in the words of Amos, to "hate evil and love the good."

Each belongs to history, was the heir of those who preceded him, grew up in his own environment, shared the blood of his race and the soil of his land. Socrates was an Athenian, Amos a Judean. Each spoke in his own language with his own accent, with the marks of his own genius, culture, and temperament, to the personal, social, economic, moral, and religious condition of his people. Each had deep insight into the meaning

of life, and therefore also had foresight, not through clairvoyance and divination, which both abhorred and denounced. Their faith in the inevitability of the transformation of temporal affairs through eternal ideals gave them courage to do and to die in the face of a callous and hostile world.

Though closely related to their times, each rose above his race, blood, and soil, entered into controversy with his people, and became a protagonist in the name of God for a better life. Paul Elmer More says: "We have the astonishing fact that Socrates and Plato appear suddenly and inexplicably as a contradiction to the prevalent trend of their age and people."¹ This is equally true of the prophet and the Christ. While they belonged *to* history they were not *of* it. They cannot be accounted for by historical development or by emergent evolution. While Socrates helped to make Hellenism, Hellenism alone did not make Socrates. Amos was an heir of Hebraism, but Hebraism alone did not produce Amos. Jesus the Christ was born a Jew, but He was not the outcome of Judaism, or of Hellenism, or of both.

God at long intervals introduces new factors and forces into the natural and human process through men who rise above it, created not apart from, but in and through, heredity and environment. They are new ways of God's approach to men and new ways of man's access to God. To use a symbol for an indescribable fact, they are "born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God" (John 1:13).

This view contravenes the theory of borrowing, which assumes that whatever is unique in a person or

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 40.

a people is taken from a preceding or contemporary tribe or nation, and that "the nation develops most that borrows most." This assumption, however, does not explain satisfactorily the issues at stake. For what a people borrows it must absorb and transmute after its own kind. And where does its own kind, its unique genius, come from? Does not this question lead us back to an ultimate creative act, either by divine election or by natural selection—each a mystery which passeth knowledge?

Right or wrong, the philosopher and the prophet had a sense of mission, were laid hold of by a power other than themselves, and were possessed by an irresistible compulsion to speak boldly what was given them to say. "Necessity was laid upon me," said Socrates; "the word of God, I thought, ought to be considered first."² He had a "divine sign from God," which, however, only restrained him and never constrained him except by its silence. "The Lord Jehovah hath spoken," cried Amos; "who can but prophesy?" (3:8). In the words of Jeremiah: "There is in my heart . . . a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I am weary with forbearing, and I cannot contain" (20:9).

For this reason both defiantly preached and taught a way of life contrary to history; obeyed God rather than men,³ and were ready to die that men might live. Each in his own way recognized,

*"The unchangeable unwritten code of heaven;
This is not of today and yesterday,
But lives forever, having origin
Whence no man knows."*⁴

Therefore the rulers poisoned the philosopher and stoned the prophet.

If one accepts Kant's distinction between what *is* and what *ought to be*, one will have to go a step farther and concede that the immanent "what is" will be superseded by the transcendent "what ought to be." Socrates the philosopher sought it, Amos the prophet saw it, the Christ was it. All this in spite of Croce's boast that he has stripped philosophy of the rags of transcendence which were left to her by Hegel, has abolished the world of ideas which are to be contrasted with historical process, and has disposed of god other than the God who is in us and who we are. In his view all religious and ethical values which from time immemorial have been traced to another world are now assumed to be a part of no other world than that which is within and about us, and to have their origin in the civilization in which they were first discerned.⁵

One turns with satisfaction from the denial of Croce to an affirmation, which rings more true to human experience, made in an address by Professor Archibald Rutledge, until recently of the English department of Mercersburg Academy and honoured as the poet laureate of South Carolina, his native state. He would be amused, if not offended, if he were charged with being a philosopher or a theologian. For that reason, however, his words have all the more weight. He said: "I can never accept any credit for any writing that I have done, except it be the credit due a listener-in on the broadcast of the universe; for I am convinced that art is transmitted rather than created. In my own case I have long been aware that my dreams and visions, thoughts and ideas—whatever their worth—do not originate with me, but come to me from a mind apart. Together with this belief naturally goes the faith that we live close to an invisible world, where

all is order, beauty, and harmony; and that sometimes the listeners of this earth catch fragments of the eternal melody." In a similar mood Socrates spoke before he drank the hemlock: "These, my dear friend Crito, are the words that I seem to hear, as the mystic worshipper seems to hear the piping of flutes; and the sound of this voice so murmurs in my ears that I can hear no other." ⁶

Socrates lived in Greece, where men, according to a fragment of Euripides, found happiness "in searching into causes . . . and discerning the deathless and ageless order of nature, whence it arose and how and why." "The Greeks," says Aeschylus, "were not slaves nor subjects of any man." Herodotus adds, they had "one master and that master is the law." They did not acquiesce in nature nor in history, like the Orientals, but faced the world, now benignant and then treacherous, grappled with it, and made it subservient to their purposes. They built stones into temples, carved marble into statues, painted visions on canvas, sang of arms and men, played in grand style.

Socrates was a contemporary of Pericles, Euripides, and Aristophanes. His time was the most brilliant period in the history of Greece, and in some respects in the life of man. Then the Parthenon was built; Phidias carved the friezes of the temple (the Elgin Marbles), the statue of the Olympian Zeus, and the statue of Athena holding in her right hand a winged victory. Herodotus and Thucydides were writing their histories. The Ionian nature philosophers, from Thales to Democritus, had discarded mythology and explained the origin of the world without the intervention of the gods. "For the first time in the history of civilization the scientific spirit swung free from entanglements

with popular religious beliefs.”⁷ The Sophists wandered from city to city, professional teachers of poetry, oratory, music, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy. Some of them were skilled in the art of making the worse appear the better reason and were more concerned about their fees than about their pupils. They stirred up doubt and scepticism. Anaxagoras taught that there were no gods, only one great spirit pervading the universe. For this he was banished from Athens, in spite of the efforts of his friend Pericles to spare him. They were the modernists in Greece as the humanists of the Renaissance were the modernists in Italy.

It is to the credit of Socrates that while he lived in Periclean Athens he not merely profited by its culture but advanced beyond and stood in judgment upon it. “If Athens needed a Socrates, Socrates needed an Athens.” He doubtless was taught, like other Athenian youth, gymnastics and music, and memorized portions of Homer and Hesiod. At eighteen he became a member of the militia, guarding the Attic frontier. It is probable also that in his early manhood he had converse with the philosophers who taught in Athens at that time: Parmenides, Zeno, Anaxagoras, Archelaus the physicist, and Protagoras the first of the Sophists.⁸ From childhood he heard an inner voice, a *daimonion*, which restrained but did not direct him.⁹ He had by nature a critical mind and a sceptical spirit. In physical strength and self-mastery he excelled all his comrades in arms. “In the faculty of endurance,” says Alcibiades, “he was superior not only to me but to everybody . . . though not willing to drink, he could if compelled beat us all at that.”¹⁰ His power of mental concentration enabled him to stand unmoved on one spot, rapt in thought, from dawn to dawn.¹¹ When

he was an officer of the Council of Five Hundred, his devotion to justice and his refusal to obey his peers jeopardized his office and his life.¹² He was neither an Ionian scientist nor a Homeric polytheist. Like the Ionians, he was guided by reason in his search for reality; but the object of his search was not nature but soul. When he turned away from the Ionian natural science he was of the same mind as Augustine when he speaks of science as a vain curiosity that distracts the mind from its true end, which is not to number the stars and to seek out the hidden things of nature but to know and love God.¹³

Socrates discovered the soul in man, God in the soul, and man's destiny in God. He assumed that the soul was distinct from the body, from the material world, was allied to God, and of infinite value. "Therefore, to trouble one's mind with cosmic phenomena was sheer folly. I must first know myself, as the Delphian inscription says, and I should be absurd indeed if, while I am still in ignorance of myself, I would be curious about that which is not my business." He did not, however, disparage the study of natural philosophy.¹⁴ The admonition of the Oracle—*know thyself*—resulted in his conversion and marks a turning-point in the mental and moral life of mankind. Henceforth he went in quest of "principles of justice, goodness, nobility." Xenophon says: "His conversation was ever of human things." He ceased to consider the origin and essence of things and spent his life on the purpose and end of man. A Hindu is said to have asked Socrates: "Tell me what is the substance of thy teaching?" Socrates replied: "Human affairs." "But," said the Hindu, "you cannot know human affairs if you don't know first the divine."¹⁵

"I have no other business," he tells his judges, "but to go about persuading you all, both young and old, to care less for your body than for the perfection of your souls, and to make that the first concern: and telling you that goodness does not come from wealth, but it is goodness that makes wealth or anything else, in public or private life, a thing of value for man . . . I shall not change my way though I were to die a thousand deaths."¹⁶

Socrates lived among the Sophists and broke away as they did from the current religious, social, and moral views of life; yet he was more than a Sophist, many of whom taught merely the fine art of becoming citizens to one's own advantage. He claimed the right of independent thought and action even though he offended traditions and customs sanctioned by centuries. Self-interest did not play a part in his life. He denied that he took money for teaching men.¹⁷ Like the Sophists, Antiphon for example, he distinguished the laws of nature from the laws of the state; the former he regarded as eternal, ordained of God, and the way to self-preservation and happiness; the latter as temporal and man-made, enjoining behaviour that is unnatural and harmful to the soul's welfare. Like Rousseau he went back to Nature. The intelligent youth of Athens eagerly followed him. The result was the rise of a group of forward-looking men whose views of life were contrary to the laws of the state, to the traditional religious beliefs, and to the precepts of the elder statesmen. In place of the "morality of social constraint," he put "the morality of aspiration to spiritual perfection"; the one is a life of bondage, the other of freedom. He was a teacher, not a lawgiver. The lawgiver prescribes rules of conduct which the

average man can obey. The teacher opens men's eyes to see a vision of life which they never can quite realize; yet they cannot help striving for it and thus leave to their children a world a little better than the one into which their fathers were born.¹⁸

Men of that sort will always be brought under suspicion, accusation, and condemnation. The people ignored him; Aristophanes satirized him; Meletus lodged the formal indictment that "Socrates is guilty of crime: first, for not worshipping the gods whom the city worships, but introducing new divinities of his own; next, for corrupting the youth. Penalty: death." In the "Clouds" Aristophanes puts into the mouth of Socrates: "What Zeus? Nay, jest not, there is none." He also charges him with a rationalistic explanation of thunder and rain.

Socrates not only described but suffered the fate of the just man who "will be scourged, racked, bound, will have his eyes burnt out; and at last after suffering every kind of evil will be impaled"—the Greek version of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. Socrates himself had no form or comeliness . . . no beauty that we should desire him.

In his search for reality he was guided by reason. In the "Phaedo" he defines his method of procedure: "I first assumed some principles which I judged to be strongest; and then I affirmed as true whatever seems to agree with this . . . and that which disagreed I regarded as untrue."¹⁹ In the words of Xenophon, "He conducted discussion by proceeding step by step from one point of general agreement to another."²⁰

But reason in the world of soul has a way to reality different from the way in the world of matter. Socrates feared, therefore, that by the pursuit of natural science

he would lose "the eye of the soul," and thus he would be blinded if he looked only at things or tried by the help of the senses to apprehend them. "I thought," said he, "I would better have recourse to ideas, and seek in them the truth of existence." In other words, he had reasons which the reason did not understand. He marked the end of the Ionian *Aufklärung* (Enlightenment) and the beginning of Greek romanticism. He made room for the irrational part of the soul (*ἄλογον μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς*).

He was not a polytheist, a naturalist, or a Sophist; though guided by reason, he did not reject the myths with disdain: he regarded them as vehicles of naïve science and ethics, of the heaven that lies about us in our infancy. However, the knowledge that was obtained in a super-rational way he accepted with suspicion and put to the test of "the sane mind." He claimed to have only "such wisdom as is attainable by man."²¹ Yet he speaks of ecstasy as "inspired madness from which noble deeds have sprung."²² Thus he left the door open for revelation. Even Heraclitus is said to have been an intuitionist, "cool and scornful toward the logical way of finding truth."

Socrates was not a scientist, a theologian, or a philosopher, in the technical sense. He was a philosopher because he was a lover of wisdom, which he considered the equivalent of virtue. He made the virtues knowledges: *ὁ Σωκράτης ἐπιστήμας ἐποίει τὰς ἀρετάς*.²³ To know is to be. The Hebrew said, "The fear of God is the beginning of wisdom"; the Greek philosopher said, "To know the right is the beginning of wisdom."²⁴ He was the incarnation of a new spirit aspiring to "absolute beauty and goodness and greatness," the "gadfly"²⁵ of Athens, who stung its youth to a consciousness of a

better life. For this he lived and died. Diogenes Laertius says: "He was the first philosopher who was tried and put to death." Like the Nazarene, he never wrote a book; he did something greater; he inspired lives, gave men a new vision and a new purpose, which reached consummation in the eternal. His disciples and those who came after him may have been greater philosophers. They wrought and wrote out metaphysics, theology, ethics; but they all revered Socrates as their master, who had achieved in his life what they defined in their books: the secret of happiness, the peace of mind which the world cannot give.

True, Socrates remained a Greek in his point of view and in his method of approach to reality. He, also, did what Herodotus said of Homer and Hesiod, "made the generation of the gods for the Greeks," and what Aristotle said of the ancients, "made gods out to be men of eternal duration." But the god of Socrates was more than the animism of the Pelasgians, the half-moralized Olympians of Hesiod, or the metaphysical abstraction of Aristotle, the unmoved mover of all things, who contemplates only himself, does not work in or upon the world, and cares not for men. The god of Socrates was made after the image of the ideal man: "In God is no unrighteousness at all—he is altogether righteous; and there is nothing more like him than he is of us, who is most righteous."²⁶ He cannot be cajoled by atoning rites, by prayer or sacrifice. There is, in the judgment of Socrates, only one error more dangerous and more offensive, and that is the Epicurean view that He takes no interest in the affairs of men.

Philosophy at its best is a *preparatio evangelica*, a hunger of the soul and a confession of inability to sat-

isfy it. Aristotle said happiness can be predicated only of a complete life. Both Plato and Aristotle were not satisfied with good citizenship in a Greek city-state. Did not Athens compel Socrates to drink the hemlock? They felt that life was more than patriotism. They sought the ideal life in philosophy, in the love of wisdom and the practice of virtue, which included far more than loyalty to the State. They entered the realm of the invisible and the eternal, for there only could the immortal in man find satisfaction. But the God of Plato is "One who waits to be found by man,"²⁷ not the God of the prophets who went in search of and cared for men. While the Greek at his best was in quest of the abundant life, he found it only when he encountered Him who "was life and the life was the light of men" (John 1:4).

Professor Cornford concludes his weighty little book, entitled *Before and After Socrates*, with the following paragraph:

In pre-Socratic science we saw something of the attitude of wondering childhood; in certain utterances of the Sophists we heard the accent of the adolescent rebellion against authority. In Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, Greek philosophy grows to the maturity of responsible manhood and the fulness of intellectual power. But the extravagance of the intellect seems destined to overreach itself as surely as the extravagance of the myth-making imagination. Then nothing remains but the philosophy of old age, the resignation of a twilight that deepens alike over the garden of pleasure [the Epicureans] and the hermitage of Virtue [the Stoics].

Amos marks a turning-point in Hebrew prophecy, as does Socrates in Greek philosophy. Professor Lake

says: "In the eighth century came one of the great 'jumps' in the intellectual and spiritual history of the race."²⁸ Amos and Socrates differed from each other as the Greek differed from the Hebrew, the Aryan from the Semite, philosophy from prophecy. It is a difference not merely of race, blood, and soil, but of the mode of approach to reality and of the way of life. While each had his own background, in the dim distant past they had a common subsoil.

The earliest stratum of Greek and of Hebrew religion was animism, the belief that the animate and inanimate objects of nature have in them magic power which is capable of hurting or of helping man; and that men in turn can influence nature by formulas, rites, and ceremonies.²⁹ Professor George Foot Moore says: "Sacrifice and offering, hymn and prayer, expiation and purification, propitiation of the kindly gods and thanksgiving for their bounty, placation of the dreaded powers of the nether world, riddance of demons and ghosts—these are the component parts of the cultus, as among other peoples on the same plane of civilization all over the world."³⁰

Out of this soil emerged the tribal god Yahweh and the Olympian Zeus. But at the point of emergence from primitive animism, for reasons which perhaps can never be explained, the Hebrew went in one direction, the Greek in another. The Greeks made their gods; the Hebrews were made by their God. In other words, the Greeks professed to have men-made gods and the Hebrews to have god-made men. Thus the Greeks gradually passed from animism through Olympian anthropomorphism into philosophic monotheism; the Hebrews, from polytheism through tribal henotheism into prophetic monotheism. Philosophic monothe-

ism, whether it be that of Socrates or of Aristotle, in time fell into the background; and the monotheism of the prophets, modified of course, became the centre of the three most influential religions in the West—Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism.

One can trace progress from a lower to a higher plane in the prophets' conception of God's character, purpose, and scope of action in nature and in history; from Yahweh, a tribal god, to the Eternal God of the universe. Professor George Adam Smith says: "Behind the national deity of Israel, and through the obscure and vain imaginations the early nations had of Him, there were present the character and will of God Himself, using the prophet's low thoughts and symbols to express Himself to them, lifting them always a little higher."

The way of approach to ultimate reality in Palestine and Mesopotamia differed from the way in Greece and Asia Minor—a difference not only in degree but in kind, proof of which is the consummation of prophecy on the one hand and of philosophy on the other. Each pointed beyond itself: philosophy to mysticism, either of the cults or of Neo-Platonism; prophetism to Christ and Christianity.

The difference between prophetism and philosophy and other religions is rooted in the conviction that the Hebrews were adopted by God through His free choice and that the adoptive relation was conditioned by an ethical covenant and kinship. The prophets, in opposition to the reign of blind chance, inexorable law, or unchangeable fate, proclaimed God as a free and a purposive person who dealt with men and nations as responsible persons. The Hebrews regarded creation as a voluntary act; the Greeks, as a natural process. Therefore

God "called Abraham to be His Son . . . He chose Isaac; He chose Jacob; He called seven thousand in Elijah's day, who stood firm against the idolatry of their time; He chose the faithful remnant on whom Isaiah set his hope—the saving salt of a lost people. Last of all He ordained as His Son Jesus the son of David 'according to the flesh,' and through Him brought a multitude out of all nations into 'adoptive sonship.' At every point a free, personal act of God."³¹ This is the kind of God whom the primitive man, the civilized humanist, the modern scientist, cannot understand; for He passeth knowledge and reveals Himself only to them that fear Him.

With such a God the prophets felt that the Israelites were "a people dwelling alone;" that their God and the Canaanite gods were essentially different. So they gave no place in their worship to the sensuality of the neighbouring cults. For the same reason the prophets taught them that they were a people chosen to be the bearers of ethical monotheism to the other nations. Furthermore, if the chosen people prove false to the conditions of adoption, God will reject them and call others to fulfil his purpose. The other nations, the Greeks included, were related to their gods by nature, by a physical, rather than an ethical, kinship—a national solidarity between the tribe and the tribal god.³² When they passed away, their gods died with them. When the Holy City was sacked, the temple destroyed, the people deported, Jehovah survived and is now worshipped as the Lord of Heaven and Earth. Prophetism lives as a spiritual force not because it solved the problems of social justice or prepared a programme literally applicable to our day, but because the prophets proclaimed the God of Justice and Mercy

who is in the centre of the human struggle for a better world.³³

Amos was the end of an old and the beginning of a new era in prophecy. He was a "herdsman" and a "dresser of sycamore trees" in Tekoa, about ten miles south of Jerusalem (Amos 1:1; 6:14). Jehovah took him from following the flock and sent him to prophesy unto his people.³⁴ Of him, also, one may say as they said of Jesus, he "never learned" (John 7:15): "Whence hath this man these things?" (Mark 6:2). This is true only in the sense that he was taught not of men but of God. He appears and disappears suddenly at Bethel with meteoric swiftness and brilliance. But he left behind him a word and spirit that the world has never quite escaped.

He defiantly told Amaziah, the priest at Bethel, that he was neither a prophet nor one of the sons of the prophets—*b'nae nebiim* (Amos 7:14). In other words, Amos did not belong to soothsayers and diviners resembling Greek oracles, or to the roving bands of prophets who worked themselves into a frenzy with the aid of music and intoxicating liquors, at times lying naked on the ground and uttering inarticulate cries (I Sam. 10:5; 19:24), called mad fellows by members of the royal court (II Kings 9:11). Nor was he taught in one of the schools of the prophets, many of which, having become professionalized and commercialized, compromised with the prophets of Baal to win the favour of kings, priests, and people. They had the name, but had lost the spirit, of the prophet.

Notable exceptions in the early history of Israel were Deborah, Elijah, Elisha, Samuel, and Micaiah, who prepared the way for Amos, and were zealous missionaries of Jehovah at a time when the people

were resorting constantly to the seductive worship of Baal. Amos worked no miracles (Elijah and Elisha wrought many miracles), took no fees, used no prophetic technique, dwelt apart from prophetic schools. Jehovah spoke and he prophesied. Contemporaries or spiritual successors of Amos were Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel—each of them a champion of Jehovah, bearer of His ever-widening and deepening message, without concern for the prediction of future events but wholly devoted to the prevalence of God's holy and righteous will in their time and condition.

The prophets proclaimed a God who was ever active in the world to realize His purpose of justice and love in men. The gods of the Greeks had no eternal and all-including purpose to which the forces of the universe were subservient. The Greeks, therefore, reduced history to cyclic recurrence. The Hebrew prophets looked forward in hope, not the hope of the easy-going optimism of the eighteenth century, or of the Darwinian tragic struggle for life, or of the Marxian economic necessity; but a hope founded upon faith in a transcendent personal God in control of the universe.

Amos was the prophet of ethical monotheism. What was in seed even in the old Semitic tribal gods and later in Samuel, Elijah, Elisha, and Micaiah sprouted in Amos. Samuel made prophecy a political factor in Israel, Elijah an anti-Baal force, and Amos a plea for social justice. What was in Amos blossomed and ripened in his successors. In the deutero-Isaiah the religion of Yahweh becomes a universal religion.³⁵ But Amos, long before Second Isaiah, described Yahweh as God of nature and of nations; the God who was

never a cosmic force or a great and good man deified, as in the Roman Empire, in modern India, Russia, Germany, and America. The God of Israel is "he that formeth the mountains, and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought; that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth—Jehovah, the God of hosts, is his name" (Amos 4:13). Nature and history depended upon God and God was not an emergence from nature and history. He was both Lord and Judge. His righteous will was the criterion of judgment. "Are ye not as the children of Ethiopia unto me, O children of Israel? Have not I brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt and the Philistines from Caphtor and the Syrians from Kir?" (9:7). In the first chapter Amos pronounces punishment upon six nations besides Israel and Judah—each guilty of violating persons, their rights and their possessions; of the sin of inhumanity to man. When the horizon of Israel widened and the Egyptians, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks and Romans came within the scope of their vision, the successors of Amos proclaimed the same God as Lord of heaven and earth. He was the same God of whom Peter spoke in the house of Cornelius; who "is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness is acceptable" (Acts 10:34-35).

Amos proclaimed the Eternal as inescapable: "Though they dig into Sheol, thence shall my hand take them; and though they climb up to heaven, thence will I bring them down. And though they hide themselves in the top of Carmel, I will search and take them out thence; and though they be hid from my sight in the bottom of the sea, thence will

I command the serpent, and it shall bite them" (Amos 9:2, 3).

He is not only God of might and of right but also of mercy. He is holy because He is just and merciful. He punishes the unrighteous in order that He may save them. True, the eyes of Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdom and He will destroy it from off the face of the earth, all sinners shall die by the sword. But He will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob. "For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth." He that formeth the mountains and createth the wind forgiveth those who repent of their evil ways: if they seek Him, they shall live. Jehovah condemns, but He also repents and says: "It shall not be" (Amos 7:3, 6).

Ethical monotheism, strange as it may seem, was followed by individualism. Ezekiel said: "When the righteous turneth from his righteousness and committeth iniquity, he shall even die therein. And when the wicked turneth from his wickedness, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall live thereby" (33:18-19; Jeremiah 31:29-30). Men were no longer inseparable parts of a tribe or nation through bonds of race, blood, and soil. Natural and human barriers were broken down. They did not remain slaves of national ideas and social conventions; they were liberated from the bondage of the local and the temporal, from the traditions of men, and entered the freedom of the timeless and spaceless life. Each man is brought face to face with God—God and the soul, the soul and God; and the bond between them is righteousness, the soul's response to the will and word of the Lord spoken through His prophets. Time came when the Greeks

also turned from the religion of the state to the supernatural cults through which they sought personal immortality.

This ideal is at the root of the doctrine of the remnant which was the beginning of a new kinship between man and man as well as between God and man—a supernatural and supernatural messianic fellowship, the hope of which was expressed in various symbols in prophecy and apocalypse (Isaiah 4:3-5; Ezekiel 37:12-14; Malachi 3:16-17; 4:1-2; Daniel 7:13-14, 22-27; Enoch 42:7-8, 14, 16). Through Jesus and His spirit in the disciples the idea of the remnant was transmuted and fulfilled in the Church Catholic, in which there shall be neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, man and woman; but all shall be one man in Christ Jesus. To the remnant belong all those who everywhere and always do justly, love kindness, and walk humbly with God (Micah 6:8); who live and walk in the Spirit. Ethical monotheism is the primary premise of human catholicity—a catholicity that is more than human, philosophic, imperialistic, industrial, yea includes all these, but is born of a Spirit who is above man, in man, like man, and of God.

With ethical monotheism came a new sense of sin—what it is, what are its consequences, how men are to be delivered from it. Amos was not an echo of the past but a voice from above in the present and for the future. He announced the day of Yahweh, but it was a day of judgment not of joy. "Woe unto you that desire the day of Yahweh" (5:18). He saw men and their deeds in the light of the holy and righteous God. The sins which the prophet exposed and damned were individual and social, sins against man and against God. The two are inseparable. No man sinneth unto

himself any more than he liveth unto himself; he always sins against himself, his fellows, and his God.

Israel had passed from pastoral and agricultural into urban and industrial life. The herdsman of Tekoa was a watchman of the Lord and an observer of men. He pondered long what he saw and with an irresistible impulse he spoke what he heard. He came like a bolt from the blue to the sanctuary at Bethel. What was wrong in Samaria? Precisely what is wrong in Europe, Asia, Africa, America today. They were selling the righteous for silver and the needy for a pair of shoes (2:6). "A man and his father went unto the same maid to profane the holy name." The kine of Bashan, that oppress the poor and crush the needy, say unto their Lords, "Bring, and let us drink." They had their cocktail rooms and their night clubs, in Hebrew style, where they made merry, eating the fatted lambs and the calves, singing idle songs to the sound of the viol, drinking wine in bowls, and anointing themselves with oils. And, what was more damnable, "They are not grieved for the affliction of Joseph." They took no heed of Lazarus at the gate. The needy in court were not heard, for the judges favoured the exploiters (5:12).

Therefore the Lord Jehovah hath sworn by Himself: "I abhor the excellence of Jacob, and hate the palaces; therefore will I deliver up the city with all that is therein" (6:8). No wonder Amaziah the priest sent to Jeroboam the king, saying, "Amos hath conspired against thee in the midst of the house of Israel: the land is not able to bear all his words" (7:10).

Herodotus opens his history with the statement that the wars of the Greeks and Persians were the manifestation of a secular antagonism between Asia and

Europe. The English historian Freeman calls this the Eternal Question. I venture to say that Amos raised an issue far greater than the conflict between Persia and Greece—an Eternal Question which men will have to face long after the wars of Persia and Greece are forgotten.

If Amos condemns anything more than injustice and licentiousness, it is the hypocrisy of those who would cover their sins by the recital of a ritual instead of a return to righteousness. With biting sarcasm he cries: "Come to Bethel and transgress . . . bring your sacrifices every morning and your tithes every three days and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened, and proclaim free-will offerings and publish them: for this *pleaseth you*" (4:4). Jehovah cannot thus be hoodwinked or cajoled. "I hate, I despise your feasts and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. . . . Take thou away from me the noise of your songs, I will not hear the melody of the viols." Instead of religious frivolities and insincerities, Jehovah demands that justice roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream (Amos 4:4; 5:21-24). This refrain, sounding in louder or lower tones in all the subsequent prophets, is sounded centuries later, as through a trumpet, by John the Baptist and is heard in the pleading words of Jesus: "I desire mercy, not sacrifice" (Matt. 9:13; 12:7).

The repentant Jehovah, the demand for righteousness, the assurance of mercy, the spirit and mission of the remnant, all of which are found in seed in Amos, point the way to the cloud-capped peaks of prophecy; to Him whose thoughts are not our thoughts and whose ways are not our ways, who is God not man, yet who will have mercy and abundantly pardon the wicked

who forsakes his way and returns to Jehovah, our God (Isaiah 55:7, 8); to Him who hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows . . . who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities (Isaiah 53:3-5); to Him upon whom rests the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Jehovah, who with righteousness will judge the poor and decide with equity for the meek of the earth (Isaiah 11:1-5); to the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity . . . and who dwells "with him also that is of a contrite and humble spirit" (Isaiah 57:15); to the devout soul that finds the supreme good not in material values—in flocks and herds, in peace and plenty, in health and length of years, in protection against earthquakes and floods—but in spiritual values—in the presence and guidance of the Lord; for "whom have I in heaven but thee? And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee. My flesh and my heart faileth: But God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever" (Psa. 73:23-26); to the time when the dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: His kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him. Here is the end of the matter (Daniel 7:27-28). This is what the prophets have seen and heard and heralded, because they believe that the basic power of the universe is the holy, just, and merciful Creator and Upholder of matter and mind.

But here is not "the end of the matter;" for at the end of the road of prophecy are a son whose name is "Jesus," an angel of the Lord saying, "I bring you good tidings of great joy" (Luke 2:19), shepherds going to "see this thing that is come to pass" (2:15),

magi guided by a star to "the young child" (Matt. 2:9), a man in the desert "clothed with camel's hair" who announced one coming after him that is "mightier than I" (Mark 1:7), a Galilean at the head of a procession entering the gates of Jerusalem, when all the city was stirred, saying: "Who is this?"—the question that men everywhere will ask and answer to the end of time.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *The Sceptical Approach to Religion* (Princeton University Press, 1934), p. 29.

² Plato, *Apology*, Jowett's translation (New York, Scribner, 1890), I. 319.

³ *Ibid.*, I. 327.

⁴ Sophocles, *Antigone*, Young's translation; words spoken by Antigone in answer to Creon.

⁵ See C. C. J. Webb, *The Historical Element in Religion* (London, Allen, 1935), pp. 61-62.

⁶ Plato, *Crito* 54.

⁷ W. G. De Burgh, *The Legacy of the Ancient World* (New York, Macmillan, 1924), p. 97.

⁸ W. E. Leonard, *Socrates, Master of Life* (Chicago: Open Court Pub. Co.), p. 33.

⁹ Plato, *Apology* 31; see also Leonard, pp. 101-104. "Euripides and Thucydides, both men of the Enlightenment, use it [*daimonion*] of that which, given by fate, man must adjust himself toward and to."—p. 101.

¹⁰ Plato, *Symposium* 219 (Jowett's translation).

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 220.

¹² *Apology* 32.

¹³ C. H. Dawson, *Mediæval Religion* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1934), p. 61.

¹⁴ *Apology* 19.

¹⁵ Leonard, *Socrates, Master of Life*, pp. 98-99.

¹⁶ *Apology* 30.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹⁸ See Kirsopp Lake, *Paul: His Heritage and Legacy* (Oxford University Press, 1934), p. 48. What Lake says of Jesus I prefer to apply to Socrates.

¹⁹ Plato, *Phaedo* 34.

²⁰ *Memorabilia* IV. 6.

²¹ *Apology* 25.

²² Plato, *Ion* 554.

²³ Aristotle, *Magna moralia* I. 1.

²⁴ Leonard, *Socrates*, p. 80.

²⁵ *Apology* 31.

²⁶ *Theætetus* 176 (Jowett's translation).

²⁷ See H. R. Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology* (New York: Scribner, 1937), p. 71.

²⁸ *Paul* . . . p. 25.

²⁹ See T. J. Meek, *Hebrew Origins* (New York: Harper, 1936), p. 79.

³⁰ *History of Religions* (New York: Scribner, 1913), I, 469.

³¹ C. H. Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for Today* (New York: Doran, 1920), p. 36.

³² Christopher Dawson, *Religion and the Modern State* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1936), p. 74.

³³ Louis Wallis, *God and the Social Process* (University of Chicago Press, 1935), p. 176.

³⁴ The prophets felt themselves called of God. See Numbers 23:12, 26; 24:13; Isaiah 6:1-13; Jeremiah 1:5; Ezekiel 8:1-4.

³⁵ Rudolf Otto, *The Idea of the Holy* (Oxford University Press, 1923), p. 77.

II

JESUS

"Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee."—MARK 1:9.

"And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, . . . full of grace and truth."—JOHN 1:14.

"Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee and was baptized of John in the Jordan." So Mark introduces Jesus to his readers. Who was Jesus? He was a carpenter "about thirty years of age (Luke 3:23), the son of Mary (Mark 6:3), the son of Joseph (Luke 4:22; John 6:42). Four of His brothers are named (Mark 6:3); He also had sisters whose names are not given. He was reared in Nazareth as any Jewish boy of His time. In His youth and early manhood He said or did nothing that attracted the attention of His companions, His family, His fellow craftsmen. Nazareth was more or less despised by Judeans, who asked, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" (John 1:46). Galilee was a small province of the Roman Empire. Jesus doubtless spoke Aramaic, not the Hebrew of the Old Testament, not Greek or Latin. Neither before nor after His public appearance was He known in Ephesus, Athens, or Rome. He was of no reputation. Even after His crucifixion, the knowledge of His words and work was limited to a narrow territory and to an obscure group of common folk.

When Festus referred to Paul before Agrippa, he spoke of him with the same official indifference as he would of any other prisoner, saying that the accusers "had certain questions against him of their own relig-

ion, and of one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive" (Acts 25:19). That was all that a Roman governor knew about the Nazarene. Anatole France wrote a tract on "The Procurator of Judea" in which he shows "both the insight of a historian and the master-touch of a great artist." He represents Pilate as resting at Baiae and conversing with his friend Lamia. When Lamia asked him how it was with Jesus and His crucifixion, Pilate thought for a moment, shook his head, and replied, "I cannot remember the affair."¹ Jesus was only one of thousands who suffered the fate which Roman proconsuls regarded as a trifling matter.

After Jesus' baptism He returned to Galilee, no longer a carpenter but a herald of the Gospel of God (Mark 1:14). He appeared suddenly at an unexpected time and place and in an unexpected way. When He taught in the synagogue His townsmen were astonished, some of them were "offended in him" (Mark 6:3) and "cast him forth out of the city" (Luke 4:29). They asked, "Whence hath this man these things?" (Mark 6:2), for "his word was with authority" (Mark 1:27; Luke 4:32). "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" (Mark 6:3). He was "not as the scribes," who were taught in the schools. Later the Jews in Jerusalem marvelled, saying: "How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?" (John 7:15). Jesus in turn marvelled at the unbelief of the Nazarenes.

Jesus belonged neither to a Jewish sect nor to a political party. He was not a Pharisee, a Scribe, an Essene, a Zealot, a Herodian. He was a layman, self-

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 66.

taught or rather God-taught. Evidence is lacking that Jesus had aspirations to leadership in either a religious or a political way. Men followed Him and were called disciples. But Jesus did not think of founding a school like the school of Gamaliel at Jerusalem or the school of the philosophers at Athens. He proclaimed "good tidings from God": "The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the gospel." He was preacher and teacher of the kingdom, and at the same time its presence and power in personal form. Through Him the blind received their sight, the lame walked, the lepers were cleansed, the deaf heard, the dead were raised up, and the poor had good tidings preached to them (Matt. 11:5; Luke 4:18). Therefore the common people heard Him gladly. He taught by what He said and did, by what He was, and by the way He died. "He appointed twelve, that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have authority to cast out demons" (Mark 3:14, 15).

This carpenter of Nazareth boldly assumed authority above that of the Scribes, ignored and controverted the Pharisees, invited the people with a touch of audacity, saying: "Come unto me and I will give you rest." He even relegates John the Baptist to an order now superseded: the least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he (Matt. 11:11). Jesus is the word of God and the work of God, the fulfilment of prophecy and the prophecy of fulfilment. Always prophets and righteous men will see in Him and hear from Him what they long for and aspire to. "The earnest expectation of the creation, . . . groaning and travailing together until now," was satisfied by the Man of Nazareth and the Christ of God (Romans 8:19-22). Jesus

knew Himself to be God's final messenger, after whom none higher can come.²

In His early ministry He stirred up great enthusiasm among the people. "They came to him from every quarter" (Mark 1:45). He aroused bitter hostility among the Pharisees, who, with the Herodians, "took counsel against him, how they might destroy him" (Mark 3:6). The enthusiasm of the multitude cooled towards the end of His ministry (John 6:66); His enemies became more hostile and finally crucified Him.

Opinions about Him differed widely. No one thought Him to be an ordinary man. He spoke as man never spake. His friends became alarmed because of the excitement He aroused. They went out to lay hold of Him, for they said, "He is beside himself" (Mark 3:21). Even His mother and His brethren sent unto Him to take Him away from the crowds (Mark 3:31). "His brethren did not believe on him" (John 7:5). The Scribes said, "He hath Beelzebub, and by the prince of demons casteth he out demons" (Mark 3:22). Herod said He was John the Baptizer risen from the dead; others said He was Elijah or one of the prophets. Peter said He was the Christ (Mark 6:14, 15; 8:29). Pilate found no fault in Him; but to please the Jews he delivered Jesus to be crucified (Mark 15:15). After His crucifixion, His disciples were convinced that God raised Him from the dead. On Pentecost they were filled with His spirit; and Peter proclaimed Him who was crucified both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36).

These facts are recorded in documents of the first century and can be proved by historical investigation in the same way as the facts in the life of Alexander the Great and of Julius Cæsar.

When one asks, "Who is this?" the primary issue is not whether He was the Christ, "the Anointed of God," the "man from heaven," the "Prince of the House of David," "the Son of Man," "the Son of God." Did these attributes belong to Him by nature or were they ascribed to Him by His followers? Did Jesus believe Himself to be what His first disciples thought He was?

These are apocalyptic terms and were used in connection with such phrases as the "Life of the world to come," the "Day of the Messiah," the "Messianic Age," the "Present world." Both Jesus and His disciples may have accepted them because they were the only terms at hand to express what He felt Himself to be and what they felt that He was. However, in setting Himself into this apocalyptic framework Jesus transmuted it and, one may say, destroyed it by giving the old phrases new content. The new wine broke the old wine-skins.

The "present world" and the "world to come" meant things quite different to men who lived before Jesus and then lived with Jesus, who knew Him teaching, healing, crucified, risen, glorified, and had His spirit in them. The two worlds now represent two qualities of life, not following each other in time, but co-existing here and now and diametrically opposed in principle and purpose. The word "Israel" was given a new meaning—not the Israel of the flesh but "of God." "The Prince of the House of David" was not the one whom the prophets, the apocalyptists, the people, expected; He was rather the Suffering Servant (Isaiah 53:7 sq.; Acts 8:32, 33). We are now in the "Days of the Messiah" and are preparing for the "Age to come," but not in the sense in which the Jews or many Biblical literalists think of these things. All these

terms are eschatological and messianic, taken from Jewish scriptures, and now through Jesus they have a wholly new meaning.

Again, we may ask, was Jesus Logos, Sophia, Gnosis, Kurios, the fulness of the Godhead bodily? Was He in reality, in the language of the Nicene Creed, "God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, of the same substance with the Father, begotten not made"? or, in the language of the Chalcedonian formula, was He "truly God and truly man . . . owned in two natures without confusion, without conversion, without division, without separation"? These are Greek terms, formulated by theologians and philosophers to furnish a metaphysical background of Jesus the Carpenter and Christ the Lord. Some of them connoted that which Greek theologians found incarnate in Jesus—Who was in the beginning, was with God, was God (John 1:1).

Even the Greek words and phrases were not wholly capable of conveying the revelation of God in Christ. They, also, were like the old wine-skins broken with the new wine; and yet they were necessary attempts to put the unspeakable into words which half conceal and half reveal the truth within. Jesus is *Sophia*, but not the wisdom of this world, which puffeth up; He was the wisdom of the Cross, which buildeth up (I Cor. 8:1). "None of the rulers of this world hath known" it (I Cor. 2:8); only those who have the mind [that is, the love] of Christ (I Cor. 2:16).

Was Jesus deceived or were the disciples mistaken? Were His enemies right when they said He was Beelzebub; and His friends when they said He was beside Himself? Did He rise from the dead, ascend to heaven, and did His spirit descend upon His followers? Was He only a prophet, a rabbi, a perfect man, a sym-

bol of God? Was He "that which was in the beginning and was with God and was God" (John 1:1)?

That all these things were believed and said in the first four centuries the historian can prove beyond reasonable doubt. Whether or not they are true will always be a matter of dispute among philosophers and theologians, to the Jews a stumbling-block, to the Greeks foolishness. Unless these terms define something in Jesus that is permanent, not changing with a changing world, that will beget faith in Him, and that cannot be doubted by His disciples in any age, they have little value for our time or any other time.

Jesus proclaimed His Gospel in the messianic terms current in His day; but the content of His message and the meaning of His life included far more than the messianic hopes of His people. His Gospel of the Kingdom of God, of the providence and the grace of God, of the atonement, of the infinite worth of the human soul, of the brotherhood of man, of the ultimate victory of sacrificing love—all this did not come from apocalyptic hopes or writings. It came down from the heights of heaven and welled up from the depths of His soul. He spoke of last things, of that which we call eschatology; but last things were separated from the present not by space but by spirit. The last things are the ultimate things with which religion always has to do. Let it be granted that Jesus believed Himself to be the Messiah, that He expected the Kingdom of God to come in a catastrophic way before the end of the generation in which He lived, that He looked forward to a resurrection, a second coming, and a judgment. This was necessarily the local and transient form of His message to man, the only way by which He could manifest Himself to His

kinsmen and beget faith in the glad tidings of God. Christianity at first was borne into both Jewish and Hellenic circles on a wave of messianism; but it had power and permanence only because it opened a new way of access to the throne of grace and revealed a quality of life that was not limited to time and space; it was the eternal life. Each age following Him and coming under the power of His word and spirit will find it necessary to define His grace and truth in terms of its conception of the supreme good, which He in turn will transfigure with the glory of His life.

The question, "Who is this?" involves far more than the historian, the biologist, the psychologist, the psychoanalyst, the dogmatician, the mystic, the moralist, can answer. Jesus confronts men now as He did then in Palestine. We must find out for ourselves, as they did for themselves, who He is. If He was the Messiah, the Logos, the God-man, what does that mean to us? No one can answer that question for us, not the apostles, the Fathers, the Schoolmen, the Reformers, the historians, the philosophers, or the scientists; their opinions must receive due consideration, but neither for us nor for His disciples, past or future, do they have final authority. Our creeds, confessions, and dogmatic definitions have no meaning for us unless He has laid hold on us and we have laid hold on Him; have found Him as Peter did at Cæsarea Philippi, and Paul on the way to Damascus, by way of revelation through personal encounter. Our faith in Him must be based upon firmer foundations than human opinion; it must rest upon revelation of the Father, which is continued in men and women through the centuries and does not change with the changing world (Matt. 16:17). Spinoza called Jesus "rather the mouth than the prophet of God."

In order that He may reveal Himself to us, we must put ourselves in the way of Him; and while we are on the way with Him, He will gradually reveal Himself to us, not by telling us who He is, not by a voice from heaven, not by mature reflection, or by "precise analytic deductive procedure," or by any "intricate techniques" now known as the scientific method. In these ways one never reaches Christian certainty, but by personal fellowship with Him, walking with Him, talking with Him, working with Him, praying with Him, suffering with Him, dying with Him; in other words, facing life with its joys and sorrows, its tasks and duties, its success and failure, in the spirit in which He faced it.

We must do what Simon and Andrew did by the seaside when Jesus said unto them, "Come after me." And straightway they left their nets, and followed Him (Mark 1:18). Such absolute surrender to Jesus' absolute command is the first step toward Cæsarea Philippi, toward Gethsemane, toward Olivet, toward Pentecost, toward the Logos become flesh, toward the Father's house, toward Nicea. Only as we follow Him, are of one will with Him and with one another, seek first the Kingdom of God, live and die in His faith and love, shall we share His power and His peace; only so shall we know the unutterable mystery which hath been hid for ages and generations, but now is made manifest to His saints (Col. 1:26).

What the prophets saw, the cults offered, the philosophers thought, the people groped after and wished for—all these things were in the Nazarene in a way and with a content men never dreamt of. Through Him all things became new. Therefore one cannot by science find Him, by logic prove Him, but by obedi-

ence of faith can enter into fellowship with Him, and through Him with the Father and with one another.

Schweitzer concludes his "Von Reimarus zu Wrede"³ with these words:

He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old, by the lakeside, He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word, "Follow thou me!" and sets us to the tasks which He has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience Who He is.

Only in this way can one escape Biblical literalism, rationalistic supernaturalism, philosophic idealism, mystic intuitionism, wishful thinking, the petrification of orthodoxy, the dissolution of the Christian faith by humanistic liberalism, the confusing and contradictory conclusions of critical scholars. The way of obedient faith leads to the love of God in Christ, which is more than a creed or a definition that may be both dogmatically and historically correct and yet does not satisfy the heart; it leads to Him who shows us the Father and gives us the abundant life.

One may call this the way of Christian pragmatism, of Christian "experimentalism," and of Christian "operational philosophy"—the daily facing of life with all its issues from the viewpoint of Jesus, in the light of a God-like Christ and a Christ-like God. Both revelation and discovery are necessary; but both must come each day through His word and spirit in the struggle for life and the life of others—through faith working in love with the patience of hope. This is to be on

the way with Him; to see Him as through a glass darkly; to pray, "Lord, I believe, help mine unbelief"; to trust Him though He slay me; to say, "I know whom I believe"; sometime to see Him "face to face."

That which made Jesus God in man and man in God must be something that the common man will gladly hear and can comprehend; that is revealed unto babes but cannot be reached by the wise and understanding, except they become as little children; that men may express in formulas of Jewish, Greek, or Roman origin, of ancient or modern time, but which the words of the finest mintage cannot convey; that gives meaning to every name or phase that is applied to Jesus by prophet, apostle, philosopher, theologian, or scientist, if such terms are to have any value; and that will lay hold of men, women, and children of every land and clime, race, blood, and soil, and win them to consecrate their lives to Him each day. All this is contained in the word LOVE—ἀγάπη.

Love is "he that hath borne our griefs," "was wounded for our transgressions," "that bringeth good tidings," and "feedeth his flock like a shepherd." Love is the stone cut out of the mountain without hands, and that brake in pieces the image of iron, brass, clay, silver, and gold (Daniel 2:45); love is "the Son of Man" Whom "all people, nations, and languages shall serve" and Whose "dominion is an everlasting dominion" (Daniel 7:14); love is that from which no tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword, can separate us; "nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us" (Romans 8:35-37). Love binds man to man, nation to nation, into a fellowship of mutual co-operation, sympathy, friendliness, goodwill. "But

whoso hath this world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him"—the kind of love that caused Him to lay down His life for us (I John 3:16-17)? Paul once wrote: "I had not known sin but by the law." When he faced the Cross and saw Christ manifested to him, he also could have written: "I had not known sin but through Jesus Christ, crucified and risen."

Love breaks down walls of partition that separate men from men—racial, national, social, religious barriers. "Christ is the end of the law" (Romans 10:4). "In Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh" (Eph. 2:13). Where the love of Christ is, "there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman" (Col. 3:11); "But now abideth faith, hope, and love: and the greatest of these is love" (I Cor. 13:13). The catholicity of Jesus was the universalism of a love which "is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him" (Acts 10:35). "The same *Lord* is Lord of all and is rich unto all that call upon him" (Romans 10:12). "Love is the Alpha and the Omega . . . who is and who was and who is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1:8). God is love (I John 4:16).

Philosophers and theologians have attempted to define the nature and the person of Him who is love, for example, in the Nicene, the Chalcedonian, the Athanasian, Creed. These creeds are a hindrance to faith when they are made a substitute for living, active love; they are helpful to believers as attempts to state in intellectual terms the content of the faith. The hope which Jesus begot in men's hearts and which they ex-

pressed in the current phrases of prophecy and eschatology, the gifts of the Spirit by which they worked wonders, the *immediate* advent of the Son of Man seated on the right hand of Power and coming on the clouds of heaven (Mark 14:62), the Logos incarnate, sacramental guarantees of salvation, penitential discipline, theological and creedal statements—all these, for the early believers and for us today, have lost, wholly or in part, their original meaning. But love never faileth, the Love that bore the Cross and is now the Lord of the Universe, in Whom we can trust and hope for a final victory over the present evil world. "Eschatology is not itself the substance of the Gospel, but a form under which the absolute value of the Gospel facts is asserted."⁴ The same may be said about theology, both ancient and modern.

The love of God in Jesus brought Him into controversy with the world and enabled Him to win the victory over the world. It revealed the wide gulf between Him and men and it bridged the abyss and showed men the way of reconciliation. It made Him Lord and Judge, and at the same time Saviour of men.

The contradiction or controversy between Jesus and the world is graphically depicted in the story of the Temptation, in the Sermon on the Mount, and in the denunciation of the Scribes and Pharisees in Matthew 23. In it one beholds the dualism between God and man, felt dimly by the savage, keenly felt by the saint. It is the *leit motif* of the human tragedy, of love and hate, of flesh and spirit, of time and eternity, of this world and the world to come. He alone Who revealed the contradiction can overcome it. He made the servant into a Son, the Master into a Father; and thus the religion of Judaism was doomed. Love made

the religion of the law impossible and unnecessary; for love is the fulfilment of the law. He created "in himself of the two one new man, so making peace"; He reconciled "them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby" (Eph. 2:15, 16).

In "the wilderness" love incarnate came face to face with hate incarnate—*der Geist der stets verneint*. The one came to save and to sanctify, the other to hurt and to destroy; the one points to the way of life, the other to the way of death. Why did Jesus refuse to turn stones into bread, to cast Himself from the pinnacle of the temple, to worship the devil? Because He was true to God, loved men, and came that they might have the abundant life—*der Geist der stets bejaht*. Why did the devil approach Jesus in the wilderness? Because he saw in Jesus the diametrical opposite of what he was and what he wanted—to cripple and to cramp the life of man.

The Temptation is the key to the understanding of history, of the Old Testament, of the Law and the Prophets, of the life, death, resurrection, and enthronement of Jesus. It was the prologue of the dramatic controversy throughout the ministry of Jesus—the conflict between this world and the world to come, between love and law, mercy and sacrifice, righteousness and ritual, self-denial and self-interest, losing life and saving it, the Cross and the Crown, God and Mammon; the prologue to a clash between Him and the Pharisees, the Scribes, the Herodians, the high priests, the Sadducees, the unresponsive multitude; to His mother's, His brothers', and His disciples' misunderstanding of Him. In other words, it was the inevitable and perpetual controversy of spirit and letter, of in-

spired persons and official authority and arrogance claiming finality of form and content. Jesus in the spirit of prophetism fought over again the battle of the prophets with the religious and civil rulers, priests and kings, and with the multitudes who went after strange gods, from Elijah to Malachi. For in principle the Scribes and the Pharisees did not differ from the priests and false prophets of Israel and Judah. The battle was more decisive since Jesus was greater than the prophets and the law, and could say with bold audacity, "Ye have heard that it was said . . . but I say unto you" (Matt. 5:21, 27, 33, 38, 43). He spoke with authority as one can speak only when he is what he says and says what he does; an authority which they who live in His spirit may share, at least in part.

The words uttered by Jesus, in a moment of prophetic exultation, were fulfilled: "I came to cast fire upon the earth . . . Think ye that I am come to give peace in the earth? I tell you, nay, but rather division" (Luke 12:49, 51). In Him was the spirit which both united and divided men, set Jews and Gentiles against Christians, and Christians against one another.

The Gospel of Mark unfolds with the inexorable inevitability of a Greek drama from John the Baptist to Jesus crucified and risen. It contains the chief act in the tragedy of the ages—the conflict between prophets on the one hand and priests and people on the other; between principalities and powers, world rulers of darkness and the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places; between the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of men; between the Church and the world, the *civitas dei* and the *civitas terrena*; between the ecumenical Christian movements and the militant atheistic nationalism or internationalism of today.

For a moment He suffered defeat; love seemed to be vanquished and hate was victor. But He was vindicated. This Jesus Whom ye crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36).

Love is not a passing emotion, not a transient ecstasy, not a sentimental aspiration or desire; indeed, the love of Christ is not *of man* but *of God*. It is foreshadowed in man but it is *incarnated* in Jesus. Man cannot discover love; God must reveal it. "Hereby know we love, because he laid down his life for us: and we ought to lay down our lives for the brethren" (I John 3:16). "God is love" (I John 4:16). These words were written by one who had heard, seen, and handled the Word of life (I John 1:1).

Love is will—will that is controlled by the eternal purpose of God working for the abundant life of man, of the individual, the family, the tribe, the nation, the race. In other words, love is the set purpose of men to live and labour in the power of God's purpose and His promise of a new heaven and a new earth in which dwelleth righteousness. Indeed, love and justice are inseparable. Love that is not righteous and righteousness that is not love are false to the purpose of God as defined in the third petition of the Lord's Prayer: "Thy will be done as in heaven, so upon earth."

Through Him, therefore, the final and eternal sin is made manifest. When men saw what He did and heard what He said—each deed and each word a revelation of love that heals, builds up, inspires trust and hope, makes glad the heart, and has for its end the abundant life of men—and yet accused Him of being in league with the prince of demons and of having an unclean spirit, Jesus pronounced His most solemn judgment, saying: "Verily I say unto you, All their sins

shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith soever they shall blaspheme: but whosoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin" (Mark 3:28-29). For no man can ascribe what Jesus did to the work of the devil or say of Him "He hath an unclean spirit" and remain human. He will fall into an abyss of the inhuman from which there is no deliverance. This pronouncement of Jesus contains one of the deepest religious and ethical insights in the New Testament. The two rocks on which Jesus and the Jews, Christianity and Judaism, divided were the Law and the Cross, a division that could be healed only when men accepted love as exhibited on the Cross as the fulfilment of the whole law.

Love is the key to the Old and the New Testaments; to creation; to history; to God; to man's destiny; to eternal life. Love is lion-like and lamb-like, is strong and is slain. Love is the spirit of prophecy, of the Church, of the Kingdom of God.

Who is worthy to open the book sealed with seven seals? The Lion of the tribe of Judah; the Lamb that hath been slain; the love of God in Jesus Christ (Rev. 5:2, 9, 12). The Seer of Patmos saw deeper into the heart of the universe and the meaning of history than the chemist, the biologist, the anthropologist, or the critical historian, when he wrote: "And every created thing which is in the heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying: Unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the dominion, for ever and ever" (Rev. 5:13).

The universality and the eternity of the Nazarene

Carpenter is the love of God in Him: that is, "his power and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honour, and glory, and blessing" (Rev. 5:12).

In his *Myth of the Twentieth Century*, Alfred Rosenberg professes to be in quest of a positive Christianity, to supersede the negative Christianity of the Church of the centuries. What Rosenberg seeks we, with the men and women of all lands and climes, profess to have found; it is above us, about us, within us, though we have realized it only in part. We have found it and are finding it in One who is Lord and "Leader" of all mankind, not only of one race and blood and soil. He came from an unexpected source, in an unexpected way, as a bolt from the blue, not from the Temple, the Cult, the Academy, the Forum. He was a peasant, a builder, a man who was never taught letters, who had nowhere to lay his head. He simply spoke of God, of God's rule, of God's love and mercy. He was more than the "perfect man" whom the Stoics described as having all the virtues of a fully developed personality. To use the words of modern psychologists, the impulse toward completeness was the most compelling motive of His life. But the abundant life which He offered men was more than the "perfect" life of the Stoics and the complete life of the psychologists.⁵

He was not an ancient or a modern man; He belongs to all the ages. He would not have understood the terminology of Fundamentalism or of Modernism, of Catholicism, of Evangelicalism, or of the Chalcedonian Formula. He did not know the meaning of transcendence or immanence, monarchy, democracy, communism, fascism. He never knew economics or politics. He was not a sociologist or a statesman. He

delivered men from religion that they might live in the freedom of the spirit of God. He knew that men needed God and bread; He gave them God and bread. He knew that God cared for Him, but He refused to cast Himself down from the pinnacle of the Temple, though assured that the angels would bear Him up; He knew that He was to win men for God, but He refused to compromise a single moment with the prince of this world; He chose the way of Calvary. He commanded no one, but invited everyone.

Never did a monarch demand more of his subjects than He: "So therefore whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple" (Luke 14:33). He proclaimed a totalitarianism of which blood, race, and soil are a part; that includes communistic internationalism and yet transcends it in height and depth, length and breadth; that demands unconditional obedience and yet gives one perfect freedom—freedom to think and to speak the true, to do the right and to pursue the good; that will permit each individual to be loyal to himself, his state, and humanity, and each tribe and nation to be true to its own genius, and to live and to labour with all nations for the welfare of all people.

He became spirit and life in His followers, and for nineteen centuries men have tried to live in His spirit and to follow in His steps. He is the absolute in a person and a life, not in a dogma, a law, an institution. He is spirit that is at once creator and creature, God and man.

He is wide as mankind, higher, deeper, broader than space. He lives in time, but He was before time began; He will be when time is no more.

According to the flesh He was Son of David; ac-

according to the spirit He is Son of God. He is an individualist, a nationalist, a socialist, a communist—but He is all these because He is supernatural and superhuman, man in God and God in man. He controls the cultural process but is not its product. He stands in judgment on it, wrestles with it, and sometime will master it—not with the sword but with the Cross.

He proclaims the Absolute, the love of God for men and in men, as the goal of human endeavour, but since men live in time and space He recognizes the necessity of the relative. He liberates the individual and the nation and seeks the honour of both. He binds individuals and nations, regardless of colour and blood, in unity of spirit with the bonds of peace. He was not the immediate solution of the social and political problems of the Roman Empire; He was then and is now the answer to a hope that sustains men in the struggle for life and that will be realized finally in the age to come.

The philosopher and the prophet prepared the way of one greater than they. His superiority was not merely in what He said and did but in what He was, which gave authority to His word and deed. He had a superhuman self-consciousness, which knew of nothing higher than Himself save God. He felt Himself to be the one that was to come and that men need not look for another (Matt. 11:3). Never did He put Himself on a level with men generally. He regarded Himself above men in this respect: they needed repentance, He needed none; no one could convict Him of sin. What men vainly longed and agonized to become He was by nature—the first of a new species of manhood (I Cor. 15:45) in the world and a new form of God's presence among men. Not only did His con-

temporaries fail to comprehend Him; but in His humiliation He was greater than He Himself knew, and He knew less than He was. Only time and eternity can reveal the height and the depth, the length and the breadth, of the fulness of God in Christ Jesus.

In the first generation of believers, His love prevailed in a practical form. They were brothers and sisters who completely detached themselves from the world and from their possessions that they might be true to Jesus, to one another, and to mankind. When they went from Galilee to Jerusalem after the Resurrection, they left everything and awaited the coming of the kingdom. Peter spoke true to fact when he said, "Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee" (Mark 10:28). To leave "all" meant to leave houses, brethren, sisters, father, children, lands, for His sake (Mark 10:29). They literally fulfilled the command of their Master to give up the treasures which moth and rust doth corrupt in order to obtain a treasure in heaven (Matt. 6:19 f.; Cf. Luke 12:33 f.).⁶ To obtain the pearl of great price they sold all they had. Whoever was not willing to take up his cross and follow Jesus was not worthy of Him. If their Master came to minister, what could the disciples do but serve their fellow men? They had the invincible conviction that while they were on earth they belonged to a colony of heaven, a world in which wholly different standards prevailed from those in this world. They were reconciled to their adversaries; they forgave one another as they prayed God to forgive them.

For the renunciation of this world they were assured of something infinitely more valuable than that which they renounced. "He shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and

mothers, and children, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life" (Mark 10:30). In the congregation at Jerusalem many of the brethren sold their lands or houses and gave the money to the apostles that they might distribute unto each according to his need (Acts 4:34-35). Dorcas made coats and garments for the poor and gave alms to the needy (Acts 9:35 f.). Paul on his second missionary journey gathered money for the congregations in Macedonia and Greece, and for the poor in Jerusalem. The Twelve, like their Master, went about preaching, teaching, healing. Through Jesus and His spirit in them they revalued all values. The fervent hope of the coming of the Son of Man and of the Kingdom that would be like Him made the present kingdoms of the world and all their glory appear worthless. They became indifferent to the kingdoms of this world because they had a vision of a kingdom infinitely superior. Their attitude toward the present world was essentially that which is defined by Paul: "The time is shortened, that henceforth those that have wives may be as they had none; and those that weep, as though they wept not; and those that rejoice, as though they rejoiced not; and those that buy, as though they possessed not; and those that use the world, as not using it to the full; for the fashion of this world passeth away" (I Cor. 7:29 f.).

They were not only concerned for their own salvation but had an irrepressible desire to proclaim the way of salvation to their kinsmen, to Jews at first and later to Gentiles also. Their faith in the coming of the Son of Man was the motive for missionary work. The believers went from house to house, village to village, like their Lord, with the good news of the

coming Kingdom and the way of preparation for its coming. Jesus called twelve, whom He especially trained for missionaries; later "seventy others and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place" (Luke 10:1). In this way what He told them in darkness they spoke in the light and what they heard in secret they proclaimed upon the house tops (Matt. 10:27; Luke 12:3; Mark 4:21-23). Jesus lighted a lamp that was not to be hid under a bushel; He laid the foundations of a city set on a hill (Matt. 5:14-15). At first the scope of missionary activity was limited to Palestine. "Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans" (Matt. 10:5).

In time the love which was the heart of the message broke through the bounds of Palestine into Samaria and Judea and unto the uttermost parts of the earth (Acts 1:8). The Gospel was borne into every land, not only by the few outstanding missionaries mentioned in Acts, by so-called "apostles and evangelists," but by the humble and lowly, the "little ones," who were neither prophets nor speakers with tongues of men or of angels; but they had love—the love of Christ—in their hearts, and the love of Christ constrained them in their lives. To "babes" God had revealed the mystery of the Kingdom (Matt. 11:25), and they went forth not trained to preach but depending upon the spirit of their Father to tell them what to say (Matt. 10:20).

The mandate of the risen Christ was fulfilled: Make disciples of all nations (Matt. 28:19). Thus was born into the world a fellowship of men, women, and children who strove to live in faith, hope, and love—the *ecclesia*, the called-out of the world; the Church, the

Lord's people who had His spirit, were motivated by His purpose, and looked forward to be with Him in the Father's house. For when men confessed that Jesus was the Christ, God in the flesh, Saviour from sin and death, they meant more than that He was a benign element of the cosmos in human form, more than a mythical hero like Mithras, more than an ideal figure like the wise man of the Stoics. He was a real person who at a definite time and at a distinct place lived in Palestine; of His life and death and resurrection, on account of which He was regarded as a Saviour, credible witnesses could be produced. This conviction was the basis of Christianity, and in the strength of it early Christianity fought and conquered its rivals and won the throne of the Roman Empire.⁷

To contemporaries primitive Christianity must have seemed an absurd attempt on the part of a handful of oriental fanatics to defy the forces of civilization and progress. It had against it all that was strongest in the ancient world—the power and authority of the Roman State, Greek science and culture, the civic life of the ancient city and the religious traditions of the ancient East. Nevertheless, these mighty forces were powerless to resist the spiritual energy of the new society. Christianity conquered. It actually created a new world.⁸

Galilean, Thou hast conquered!

The mighty conflict between the ancient world and the Christian Gospel was due to the fact that the Christian religion and the Christian ethic absolutely rejected the totalitarian claims of the pagan state and maintained that there could be complete harmony between the individual and the community only in the mystical and transcendent fellowship of the Church which is the body of Christ. The re-birth of the

totalitarian state, of the pagan Roman state in the form of Fascism; or of the Germanic pagan state in the form of Nazism; or of the Marxian state in the form of Communism, revives the old conflict between the state and the Christian Church in new forms. Time only will tell what the outcome will be. As Christians we are committed to the conviction written in the First Epistle of John 5:5: "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

For by faith in their Lord the Christians saw "life in its gigantic setting in infinity and eternity," and through their vision their deepest spiritual energies were called into action. From history they learned that sovereignty passes from the tyrant to the martyr, from the force that strikes men down to the self-sacrifice that wins their reverence; that the meek will inherit the earth, not because the course of time will bring them power, but because they will teach men a new conception of power.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Anathon Aal, *The Hellenistic Elements in Christianity* (University of London Press, 1913), p. 13. Vitellius, in 36 A.D., removed Pilate from Jerusalem to answer charges at Rome (Josephus, *Antiquities*, xviii.4.2), cited in Weiss, *History of Primitive Christianity* (New York: Wilson-Erickson, 1937), I, 308.

² Paul Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (New York: Putnam, 1904), I, 45.

³ *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (London: Black, 1910), p. 401.

⁴ C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching* (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937), p. 64.

⁵ See *The Evolution of Ethics*, edited by E. Hershey Sneath (Yale University Press, 1927), p. 298.

⁶ See Rudolf Bultmann, *Form Criticism*, translated by F. C. Grant (Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1934), p. 102.

⁷ Webb, *The Historical Element in Religion*, p. 76.

⁸ Dawson, *Religion and the Modern State*, p. xix.

III

SAUL, WHO WAS ALSO CALLED PAUL

"Be it known therefore unto you, that this salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles: they will also hear."—Acts 28:28.

Who was Saul? With the master stroke of a literary artist the author of the Acts introduces him into history with the words: "And the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul" (Acts 7:58). He was consenting by his presence, if not by his vote (Acts 26:10), to the stoning of Stephen, the first martyr of Christianity. He consorted with members of the synagogue of the Libertines (Freedmen; Moffat: Libyans), composed of men who came from the Dispersion. When these were disputing with Stephen and were not able to meet his arguments proving that Jesus of Nazareth was the Christ of God, and still less to accept the implications of Jesus' mission and message, they had recourse to false witnesses before the Sanhedrin and to stones outside the walls of Jerusalem. This tragic incident became the spark which set aflame the soul of Saul with fanatical rage and turned the pupil of the discreet Gamaliel into the arch-persecutor of the growing sect of the Nazarenes.

In his letters, written twenty and more years after his conversion, he tells us who he is. These biographical data are supplemented by narratives in the Acts. He was a Jew of the Dispersion, born in Tarsus of Cilicia, a Greek by residence, a Hebrew by blood, a

Roman citizen by inheritance. He was "brought up" in Jerusalem "at the feet of Gamaliel, instructed according to the strict manner of the law of our fathers, being zealous for God" (Acts 22:3; II Cor. 11:22). He describes himself, in the letter to the Philippians, as "a Hebrew of the Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the Church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless" (Philip. 3:5-6). He was a Jew to the core; but even as a Pharisee he did not quite deserve the scathing invective of Jesus against "the Scribes, Pharisees, hypocrites" (Acts 23). One would be slow to charge Saul with hypocrisy or with love of money (Luke 16:14) at any time of his life. After he became a Christian he did not train with the Pharisees in Jerusalem "who believed" (Acts 15:5).

Although he was born in a Greek city and was a Jew of the Dispersion, he remained loyal to the traditions of the Fathers, the strictest of his sect. He was not as those Jews of the Dispersion who "had inwardly assumed in the course of history another character than that of the people of the native land," or who "capitulated completely to the Greeks in the spiritual sphere" though "they were unaware of any real departure from the essence of their religion."¹ Such were found in Alexandria, with Philo as their leader. Paul before his conversion was not modified in spirit by Sadduceism, Essenism, Hellenism, or Orientalism. True, he belonged to the synagogue of the Libyans, but he remained a Pharisee of the Pharisees. He could speak fluently both Greek and Aramaic (Acts 21:40). He seems to have been more proud of his Jewish

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 95.

descent than of his Roman citizenship. He never ceased to pray that his kinsmen might be saved, and even wished that he were anathema from Christ for their sake (Romans 9:3; 10:1). He was by birth more than a Pharisee or than a Hellenist—too great to be confined by the limitations of the one or the other. Perhaps the phrase “zealous for God” more than any other reveals his inmost nature as a religious genius of the sort that comes at long intervals of time, and for whose living, labouring, and dying men are a little nearer to God, closer to one another, and can face life and death joyously and triumphantly.

Moreover, he was gifted with a piercing intellect, an iron will, a highly emotional nature, ever ready to martyr and to be martyred for the cause which he espoused. He was always a good man whether persecuting or persecuted. The qualities which made him a violent persecutor made him also an invincible apostle. The man who breathed “threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord” (Acts 9:1) had in him the possibility of “visions and revelations of the Lord,” of being “caught up even to the third heaven” (II Cor. 12:1, 2). He could dip his pen into gall and write words that sear and blister; he could rise from the earth after he was stoned and left for dead and continue his mission without wavering; he could plead with his converts with the tenderness of a mother; he could sing the immortal psalm of love; he could declare, with a certainty beyond the reach of science or philosophy, that nothing can separate him from the love of God in Christ Jesus; he could defy High Priests, Roman governors, raving mobs, and mutinous seamen. He was intolerant to a fault, and tolerant to the point of compromise; yet he was both for Christ’s sake and for man’s sake. His

enthusiasm was moderated by his sanity and his reason stood in judgment on his dreams.

The elements of the three great races of the Mediterranean world, whose heirs we are, blended in Saul of Tarsus—Hebrew, Greek, Roman. He was an internationalist and a cosmopolitan, and was thus fitted, as was none of the Twelve, to preach His Son among the Gentiles (Gal. 1:15, 16); to be "a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel" (Acts 9:15).

A young man of Saul's calibre, living in Jerusalem from 30–35 A.D., was bound to become a controversialist. As a member of the synagogue of the Libyans he was inevitably drawn into battle with Stephen of the Dispersion, a recent convert to Christianity.

The spirit of Jesus both united and divided men. The Man of Nazareth, following at long last in the wake of the Prophets, was really the first "pestilent fellow," "mover of insurrections," "ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts 24:5). He not only set Christians against Jews and Gentiles, but Christians against Christians—the inevitable consequence of delivering men from the religion of authority into the religion of the Spirit, from the bondage of the letter into the freedom of the Spirit.

The clash of Peter and John (Acts 2:4) with the Sadducees and the Sanhedrin was the preliminary skirmish of the battle royal of Stephen with the Libyans and the Sanhedrin. If Stephen had not appeared on the scene there might have been a concordat between the Nazarenes and the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem, for we are told that "a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith" (Acts 6:7). Furthermore, while many were scattered abroad through the persecu-

tion that followed Stephen's death, the apostles remained undisturbed in Jerusalem, probably because they were not in sympathy with Stephen's teaching.

The murmuring of the Grecian-Jewish Christians against the Hebrew Christians (Acts 6:1) involved more than an equitable distribution of alms among widows and orphans. It was a symptom of two conceptions of the scope of the mission and the content of the message of Jesus, gradually emerging and dividing the primitive Christians into a right wing and a left wing. The Twelve were part of the right wing, sorely in need of one like Stephen to deliver them from their Jewish-Christian fundamentalism; they held that Jesus, the Christ, was the completion and the crown of the Old Testament theocracy, the fulfilment of prophecy but not the end of the Law, the Temple, and the customs of the fathers. He was primarily the Messiah of the Jews and was the Saviour of the Gentiles only when they became proselytes, accepted the Law, and observed the traditions (Acts 15:5). James, the Lord's brother, who favoured this view, belonged to a group which later became known as Ebionites, an insignificant sect in Palestine without influence on the future development of the Church.² Thus the Nazarenes were regarded as another Jewish sect which might be tolerated without harm, since they claimed to represent only a revised and improved form of Judaism (Mosaism and Prophetism) and not its final dissolution.

Stephen, one of the seven, was the leader of the militant left wing, the first liberal or radical in the history of Christianity. He caught a glimpse of the newness, the supernationalism, and the catholicity which were latent in the Gospel. He saw, more or less

clearly, that Jesus Christ was the end of the Law and of religions, cults, philosophies, and ethics. The false witnesses who were suborned against him (Acts 6: 11-14) were nearer the truth than they realized when they said that Stephen spoke "words against this holy place and the law," declaring "that this Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and shall change the customs which Moses delivered unto us"—precisely what the Jewish leaders charged against Jesus. What they crucified in Jesus they stoned in Stephen. He was a prophet bearing witness to Jesus before the descendants of the prophets, who had lost their prophetic spirit, insight, and enthusiasm. For this reason Stephen's words were hair-raising and ear-splitting heresy, sedition, and blasphemy to the Sanhedrin and to the "young man named Saul." He felt that he was doing God and his nation a service by keeping the garments of those who stoned Stephen.

The sight of that tragedy, however, was the beginning of a complete revolution in his life, though at the moment the spirit in Stephen and the spirit in Paul were diametrically opposed, a contradiction which God only could reconcile. It may appear paradoxical, but the advance in the interpretation of Jesus and His mission was led by men of the Dispersion, Stephen and Paul; and, at the same time, the bitterest opposition to the advanced interpretation came from Jews of the Dispersion, the "Libertines, Cyreneans, and Alexandrians," also from the synagogues of Asia Minor, Macedonia, and Greece, who were probably more sensitive to the danger lurking in Christianity than the Palestinians.

Why did this young man Saul suddenly breathe threatening and slaughter against a comparatively

harmless folk whose leaders were "unlearned and ignorant men" (Acts 4:13)? Why did he drag men and women from their homes and throw them into prison? Why did he obtain credentials from the high priest to carry on his devastating work in Damascus? ³ He turned into a relentless persecutor not without reason. In principle Paul's first battle was with "the sect of the Nazarenes," who taught the people that the same Jesus Whom the house of Israel crucified God raised from the dead and made Him both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:36). "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth, and I also did" (Acts 26:9). Stephen's teaching meant the total loss, without any compensating gain, of all that Hebrew, Israelite, and Jew lived, laboured, and hoped for; of all that God promised them through law, prophecy, and psalmody—nothing less than the extermination of an ancient race chosen by God to fulfil a divine mission upon earth. Only later, when Paul knew "the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord" (Philip. 3: 4-8), did he gladly count for loss the heritage of his people. He was not in this mood when he saw the reprobate Stephen dying, although his face shone with a celestial glow.

Paul saw eye to eye with Scribes, Pharisees, high priests, and Libertines. All of them were convinced that their nation had "the inmost secret of things" by direct revelation; the rest of mankind was here for Israel's sake, "to serve or to chasten Israel according to the inscrutable purpose of Jehovah." They were both the recipients and the guardians of the Law, the Prophets, the Psalms, the Temple, and the customs which were the essence of the Divine Commonwealth

on earth. In II Esdras 41:55, 56 one finds a concise statement of the belief of every loyal Jew in the century before Christ: "Thou hast said that for our sakes thou hast created this world. But as for the other nations which are descended from Adam, thou hast said they are nothing, and they are like spittle, and thou hast likened the abundance of them to a drop in a bucket."

From this point of view, John the Baptist also spoke biting words to the Pharisees, who boasted of Abraham as their father: "God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham." Stephen was guilty of treason to the national idea and to the tradition of the divine privilege of Abraham's children. But, even so, when the celestial glow on Stephen's face shaded into the paleness of death, a smouldering spark fell into the heart of Saul.

The crisis in the life of Paul was the vision when he approached Damascus. In Galatians 1:16, he says: "God revealed his Son in me." He saw a light and heard a voice from heaven. The light and the voice did not come from the heavenly Messiah in whose being and coming Paul was taught to believe from childhood. To see and to hear him would not have meant anything new; it might even have confirmed him in his persecution of the Nazarenes who were degrading the expected Messiah by identifying him with Jesus.

He was convinced, and the conviction became the master light of all his seeing, thinking, and doing, that the Messiah in heaven was Jesus of Nazareth crucified. That became the text of all his sermons, the theme of all his letters (Acts 18:5; 28:31). This fact he reiterates: "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" (I Cor. 9:1); "He appeared to me also" (I Cor. 15:8); "And called me through his grace to reveal his Son in me"

(Gal. 1:15); "Who shines in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ" (II Cor. 4:6).

At Cæsarea Philippi Peter caught a glimpse of the Christ (Messiah) in Jesus. At Damascus Paul beheld Jesus in the Christ (Messiah).⁴ The former approached the Christ through the Man of Nazareth; the latter found the Man of Nazareth in the Christ of glory. This was not merely a difference of approach to the Christ, but a difference of viewpoint from which to interpret the meaning of Jesus the Christ. True, Paul could now join Peter in the Gospel of Pentecost, when he said, "God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified." But Paul, doubtless for other reasons than his vision, could interpret the scope of the mission and of the message of Jesus as Peter could not. The declaration in Matthew 16:16-18, whether it was a later amplification of Mark 8:29 or not, is undoubtedly the distinctive fact in Christianity and the foundation of the Church. "Upon this rock"—the confession of faith in Jesus the Christ—"I will build my church; and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it" (Matthew 16:18).

Furthermore, the confession that Jesus is the Christ is not the result of historical study, logical argument, or mystic intuition, but of revelation from the Father. "Flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven" (Matthew 16:17). Likewise Paul said he received his Gospel "through revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1:12). The initiative in the process of salvation is in God, not in man. Man has no claim on God, but God in His mercy will not forsake man. God alone can bridge the gulf of sin that separates us from Him. The miracle which the

Church must work perpetually in the hearts of men is faith in Jesus the Christ and the unconditional surrender of the whole life to the requirements of that faith. This will always be a stumbling-block to the Jews and foolishness to the Gentiles (I Cor. 1:23).

In the vision Paul saw not only the Christ as Jesus but himself as a persecutor of Jesus Christ. He was brought to judgment, thrown upon the earth, blinded, helpless. For this, to the end of his life, he considered himself the chief of sinners, not worthy to be called an apostle, for "I persecuted the church of God" (I Cor. 15:9). His judgment was at the same time an act of grace, not a reward of merit. He deserved to be cast away from the presence of God; but God in His mercy "laid hold on" him and made him an apostle. Henceforth he preached the faith of which he once made havoc (Gal. 1:23).

This experience was new to Paul, and the Pharisees could not accept it as true. It had not only personal significance for the apostle but national and ecumenical implications that are epoch-making in the history of religion and of Christianity. The current view of Judaism was that salvation was a reward of merit, won through the observance of the Law (Romans 10:5). The aim of the Pharisees was to attain righteousness and thus to bring Christ down from heaven (Romans 10:6); the Christ would come by necessity when complete righteousness was achieved.

Paul now discovered through revelation that the Messiah had indeed come, though men were far from the righteousness which His coming was supposed to require. God freely gave men messianic blessings long before they deserved them; His love and mercy preceded rather than followed their righteousness. Salva-

tion was a gift of grace, not a reward of merit. "By the grace of God I am what I am" (I Cor. 15:10). This was a new thing which the Pharisees could not fit into their frame of reference. It was the tension between law and grace, works and faith, which ended on Calvary for Jesus and at the Tres Fontaines in Rome for Paul.

Thus, in the Damascus vision is the dynamic, the seed, of the whole of Paul's later life, of his missionary zeal, his theology, Christology, ecclesiology, soteriology, and eschatology. For, henceforth he no longer knew Christ after the flesh but after the spirit (II Cor. 5:16). He became a new creature and saw God and man in a new light. "For I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God. I have been crucified with Christ; and it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:19, 20). But what was latent in the vision became evident in his life only through years of meditation, preaching, writing, and controversy. He was not a finished theologian immediately after his vision. He could not then have written Galatians or Romans. Even in Philippians, probably his last letter in the New Testament, he says: "Not that I have already obtained, or am already made perfect: but I press on, if so be that I may lay hold on that for which I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus" (3:12). Thus the foci of his gospel were in his vision: Jesus in the Christ who is ever living and working through nature, history, and the Church, and God in Jesus Who goes after the lost sheep until He find it (Luke 15:4).⁵

Saul the persecutor did not become Paul the apostle through a sunstroke, an epileptic fit, the fancy of an overwrought brain, an irruption of the subliminal into

the conscious mind. There was doubtless a preparation in him for the sudden revolution in his life, but the power that effected the change was the hand of God, which laid hold on him, and the spirit of Christ, which entered into him. One misses the mark when one reduces Paul's vision at Damascus to the level even of his other visions, or of those of Plotinus, Francis of Assisi, St. Theresa, John of Damascus, and many others in the Orient and the Occident. It was different in form, content, purpose, and effect. It does not come within the scope of the natural reason, of the scientific or the philosophic mind, which always permits the vision splendid to fade into the light of common day.

It is a "brute fact" which annoys the modern historians, scientists, and theologians, because it does not fit into their hypotheses. They, therefore, dispose of it by explaining it psychologically, pathologically, and historically. To explain Christianity is the quickest and easiest way to rid oneself of it. Paul explains his vision theologically and Christologically. Of course he was neither a historian nor a psychologist; yet I am inclined to take sides with him, when he says that God revealed "his Son in me," and that he was "laid hold on by Christ Jesus."⁶

One finds analogies of unexpected phenomena in the history of science. Professor Whitehead reminds us ⁷ that the Newtonian science had won its victories by revolt against rationalism, *i.e.*, against the demand of the metaphysicians that all principles or theories can be justified by the reflective intelligence. Newton advanced a "brute fact" for which no reason can be given, except that "we see it happen so." The great outstanding triumph of "brute fact" over "rationality" was indeed just the peculiarly Newtonian element in the Newtonian

mathematical physics, the formula of gravitation. Even Leibnitz complained that Newton by appealing to gravity as an unexplained property of "matter" was in effect reviving the belief in "occult qualities."⁸

Abraham, Moses, Amos, Isaiah, Daniel, Jesus, Paul, the Church which is the body of Christ—these are among the "brute facts" which cannot be justified "by the reflective intelligence," by Kant or by Hegel, by Marx or by Rosenberg; but, strange and startling as the facts are, they keep on staring men in the face, laying hold on their lives, triumphing like Newton's theory of gravitation. In their triumph is proof of their origin. Paul was more than a mosaic of mystical, magical, ethical, Jewish, Hellenistic, ideas of his time, a sort of religious medley blending with peculiarities of his temperament and his training. He doubtless made use of Jewish and Hellenic forms of thought and expression, but that which was distinctive in Paul the apostle, and in Christianity among the religions of the world, was the vision of "Jesus our Lord."

In the graphic recital of his labours and trials, Paul alludes to "perils from my countrymen" [margin, *race*], to "perils among false brethren," to "perils from the Gentiles" (II Cor. 11:23-28). In controversies with these groups he made clear the content of his vision. He was in danger of bodily harm; but this was the least of his perils. Far greater was the peril of *surrender* to the Jews, of *compromise* with the false brethren, and of *absorption* by Greek philosophy and oriental cults. To have yielded to any one of these temptations would have been fatal to Paul and to his mission. True, he became all things to all men that he might save some; but he never bent to the point of surrender, compromise, or absorption. To the end he

could say: "I have fought the good fight, . . . I have kept the faith" (II Tim. 4:7).

Among the Jews he suffered the fate of Stephen; for, like Stephen, he "confounded the Jews . . . proving that he [Jesus] is the Christ" (Acts 9:22, 29; 13:50; 14:2; 17:13; 20:3; 24:1-9; 25:1-4; 26:1). From Damascus to Rome they laid plots to kill him, for with arguments they could not refute him. By various devices he escaped: his last resort was the appeal to Cæsar (Acts 25:11). He spoke and wrote in the same temper as Jesus before the Scribes and Pharisees (Matthew 23) and as Stephen before the Sanhedrin (Acts 7), saying, "The Jews who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved" (I Thess. 2:15, 16). Tertullus before Felix charged him with being "a pestilent fellow, and a mover of insurrections among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ring-leader of the sect of the Nazarenes: who moreover assayed to profane the temple" (Acts 24:5, 6).

These words and acts confirm the statement of Eusebius that he had found "in writings of the Ancients" that at the beginning of Christianity "the priests and ancients of the people of the Jews, who dwelt in Jerusalem, drew up and dispatched letters to the Jews throughout every country slandering the doctrine of Christ as a new-fangled heresy which was hostile to God. . . . Their *apostoloi* conveying letters written on papyrus spread themselves over the earth, misrepresenting what was said of our Saviour."⁹ In other words, Paul, like Stephen, was a renegade Jew, a traitor to his nation, and a betrayer of the faith of his fathers. It was the issue between Jesus and the

Pharisees, as presented in the Gospel of Mark. Paul was now "in Christ's stead" (II Cor. 5:20, Authorized Version).

Paul demolished the two pillars upon which the Jewish theocracy rested. He wrote, (a) "Jesus Christ is the end of the law" (Rom. 10:4). Thus he denied the divine origin of the Law and its finality, or at least resolved what was always regarded as an ultimate and eternal dispensation (II Cor. 3:11-15; Rom. 3:20) into a temporary and imperfect expedient. (b) Again, when he addressed the crowd from the castle stairs on the temple mount, they listened in silence until he said God sent him to the Gentiles. Then they shouted with fanatical rage: "Away with such a fellow from the earth: for it is not fit that he should live" (Acts 22:22). Thus, he denied that the Jews were the elect nation of God, in whom the promises of the prophets were to be fulfilled. Professor Henry M. Gwatkin says: "There is no more brilliant piece of true historic insight than St. Paul's view of Judaism as a mere parenthesis in history."¹⁰

In his plea before Festus at Cæsarea, he came to the verge of compromise, if not of surrender, when he said: "Neither against the law of the Jews, nor against the temple, nor against Cæsar have I sinned at all." That is true only when one interprets his affirmation in the light of his defence before Felix: "After the Way they call a sect, so serve I the God of our Fathers" (Acts 24:14). It was precisely that *Way* which the Jews could not tolerate, because in the end it would destroy both their religion and their nation. Here Paul is in a different mood from that in which he wrote to the Galatians: "to whom we gave place in the way of subjection, no, not for an hour." He was far greater when he

refused at any cost to circumcise Titus, and when he preached judgment and resurrection before the philosophers on Mars Hill, than when he spoke before Felix, Festus, and Agrippa. Paul gained little by his appeal to Cæsar. He prolonged his life, but he reconciled neither the Jews nor the Jewish Christians; nor did he convert Cæsar, who proved to be no more friendly than the high priests and the Pharisees. Cæsar beheaded him; the Jews would probably have stoned him. Then there would be a Gate of St. Paul in the walls of Jerusalem not far from the Gate of St. Stephen; now there is a Church of the Three Fountains at Rome. Thus he was turned out of the synagogue in Asia Minor, the temple at Jerusalem, the school of philosophers at Athens, and the imperial palace at Rome, because he preached a kingdom not of this world. Reconciliation between Paul and the Jews was impossible then and will be until the one surrenders to the other, which is unthinkable.

It is more and more conceded by scholars that after his conversion Paul was, in his way of thinking and his method of argument,¹¹ wholly under the influence of the Hebrew, and not the Greek, tradition. In line with the Hebrew prophets he considered Christ, His incarnation, death, and resurrection, as central mighty acts of God in time; and the Christian community as the elect people and heirs with Christ of the consummation. Yet, in spite of his Hebraism, Paul was offensive to the Hebrews and was considered destructive of Judaism because he made two declarations: Christ is the end of the Law; there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Gentile (Rom. 10:4, 12). The reason for this is that he saw in the heavenly Messiah Jesus of Nazareth, "whom ye crucified and God made both Lord and Christ." Here is the eternal question: Was Jesus only

the carpenter of Nazareth, a teacher in Israel, or did God make Him Christ the Lord? ¹²

Who were the false brethren (Phil. 3:2, 18, 19; Gal. 6:12, 15)? Paul used the term only once when he wrote the scathing indictment, "The false brethren brought in . . . to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus." They insisted that Titus, a Greek, should be circumcised (Gal. 2:3, 4). Assuming that the fifteenth chapter of Acts is another version of Paul's visit to Jerusalem after the First Missionary Journey, the "false brethren" are the "certain persons" (vs. 1) who came to Antioch from Jerusalem and raised the inescapable issue of the conditions of salvation. They said: "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved." To settle the decisive question of the condition of salvation, Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders. There again certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed (see Acts 6:7) said: "It is needful to circumcise them [the Gentile Christians], and to charge them to keep the law of Moses" (Acts 15:5; Gal. 6:12; Phil. 3:2, 18). When Paul returned to Jerusalem after the Third Missionary Journey, he met James and all the elders, and "the brethren received us gladly" (Acts 21:17-26). But they told Paul of the many thousands among Jews "that have believed; and they are all zealous for the law" (Acts 21:20). These, like the earlier group in the first council, bitterly opposed Paul; in the first instance he compromised with Peter and James; in the second, with James and the rest. Compromise failed, as it always does, to solve a decisive problem, as the events which followed prove.

In his letter to the Galatians, Paul tells us that

Cephas came to Antioch and ate with the Gentiles until certain came from James. Then he drew back, fearing them that were of the circumcision. The rest of the Jews and even Barnabas followed Peter (Gal. 2:11-14). This was, next to the Damascus vision, the most serious moment in Paul's life. For now his opponents were not *Jews* but *Jewish Christians*; and to them Paul appeared as a heretic in the Church, not as a traitor to Judaism. Not only the validity of his own mission among the Gentiles, his claim to apostleship, the truth of his vision, his personal integrity, but the answer to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" was at stake. Does salvation come from God as a gift of grace, or is it a reward of merit? This question sooner or later must be answered by every man born into the world. Furthermore, was Christ the Saviour and the Lord of mankind, the Head of His Church?

At Antioch Paul fought the decisive battle with Peter—not at Jerusalem. The controversy with the Jewish Christians was far more perilous than that with the Jews. The former acknowledged Jesus to be the promised Messiah but primarily of the Jews only. Gentiles could share in the messianic reign on the same condition that God-fearing Greeks and Romans were admitted as proselytes to the synagogue. They had to submit to circumcision or at least to observe the law relating to foods, etc. Now that Christ had come, God-fearing or Christ-loving Gentiles were to be admitted into fellowship with the Christians, providing they were "circumcised after the custom of Moses," or at least abstained "from the pollution of idols, and from fornication, and from what is strangled, and from blood" (Acts 15:20). Yet the Gentile Christians were not on an equality with the Jewish Christians—an in-

tolerable situation which could not become permanent. The Jews denied without reservation that the Christ Whom the prophets foretold and the people expected was Jesus of Nazareth. On that specific point Paul and the Jewish Christians agreed against the Jews. They differed, however, on the place of the Law in the way of salvation—a difference which Paul explains in Galatians 3:15-26, and again in Romans 4. The law is not contrary to the promises of God, nor could it “make alive” (Gal. 3:21). It is “our tutor to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith” (3:24). He wrote the same thing in substance to the Colossians (chap. 1), in a cosmic and ecclesiastical setting. Here he no longer refers to Abraham or even to the Law. He uses the language and the modes of thought of the Greeks, as one would expect when he was writing to the church at Colossæ.¹³ Also the Jewish Christians differed from Paul in their view of the person of Christ, Whom they came to regard only as a “plain and common man.”¹⁴

But had Paul accepted the compromise of the Jewish Christians he would have renounced the essence of the Gospel which came to him “through revelation” (Gal. 1:12) and “which brake down the middle wall of partition” between Jew and Gentile. Christianity would then have become another Jewish sect or a Gentile ethics. The idea of a Catholic Church would probably not have been conceived. Salvation would have become what it was always assumed to be, a reward of merit and not a free gift of grace; it would have had its initiative in man and not in God. Paul would not have felt himself to be “a debtor both to the Greeks and to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish” (Rom. 1:14). The Gospel would have merely sup-

plemented and not supplanted other religions. Jesus Christ would not have been the end of the law but an addition to the law; *not the end*, also, of all human wisdom, mystic cults, and other religions by which men could find the abundant or eternal life. The wall of partition between Jew and Greek, bond and free, male and female, would not have been broken down (Gal. 3:28); nor would there have been a new access to the throne of grace (Eph. 2:18).

Yes, Jesus would have been only one of the prophets, one of the teachers of Israel, the best man, perhaps, whom men were to emulate; but not a new creative act of God, head of His body the Church, the life-giving Spirit. He would have died only for His convictions, as did Socrates, thus teaching us how to die. His resurrection would be merely another argument for the immortality of the soul. The exaltation of Jesus would be proof only that the good life continues after death; the Spirit of Christ would be no more than the light that comes from His words and deeds and that continues to inspire and to guide men through the ages in the Jesus way of life. Paul was deceived when he wrote: "I through the law died unto the law, that I might live unto God."

If true, these words prove beyond a reasonable doubt that Paul was not a mystic of the oriental or the occidental kind, or of the kind of the sacramental cults that were so fascinating in the decadent Hellenistic period. He did not by any sort of technique ascend into heaven to bring Christ down, nor did he descend into the abyss to bring Christ up (Rom. 10:6, 7). He did not find Him by initiation into the mysteries. God in Christ laid hold on him, addressed him, and sent him on a mission to the Gentiles. He deliberately and voluntar-

ily responded to God's call given once for all and devoted his life to it.¹⁵

With the Jewish Christians Paul fought the battle of the ages; yet it must be fought out again and again. For each age must fight its own spiritual battles as well as offer its own prayers. On that account, when a dearth of spiritual life settled upon the Church and when the world aroused itself and set itself defiantly against the Church, when the warfare between religion and science waxed hot, when Christianity was dissolving into humanism or petrifying into a moribund dogmatism and ecclesiasticism, men of God at intervals and unexpectedly came with their torches lighted at the fires that burned in the heart of Paul and proclaimed a re-formation of the Church and a revival of Christian faith, hope, and love. Among others we need but mention Athanasius, Augustine, Luther, Calvin, Wesley, Barth.

Certain Greeks came up to Jerusalem to worship and said to Philip, "Sir, we would see Jesus." They probably were native Greeks who had become proselytes of the synagogue. When Jesus heard of their request, He defined, as He never had done before, the world-wide scope of His mission and His message: "The hour is come, that the Son of man should be glorified" (John 12:23). The desire of the Greeks will be satisfied, but not until the Son of man be lifted up from the earth and will draw all men unto Him (John 12:32). Paul's mission to the Gentiles was God's answer to the Greeks in the temple. He was prepared by birth, training, and grace to show them Jesus as no one else could.

In all his missionary journeys from Antioch to Rome he had no controversy with Greeks or Romans about religion. The philosophers at Athens and the consuls and proconsuls simply ignored him. To the former he

was a "babbler" and a "setter forth of strange gods" (Acts 17:18); for the latter he raised questions about the Jewish law. Gallio at Corinth waved the mob aside, saying: "I am not minded to be a judge of these matters; look to it yourselves" (Acts 18:14, 16).

Claudius Lysias (Acts 23:8, 9), Festus, Felix, and Agrippa were favourable to him. Agrippa said: "This man might have been set at liberty, if he had not appealed unto Cæsar" (Acts 26:32). The only thing that aroused the suspicion of the Roman governors, and perhaps later in the court of Cæsar, was the fact that wherever he went he stirred up riots, with others he turned the world upside down. He seemed to be a disorderly and lawless fellow, a trouble-maker. This was the one thing that Rome would not tolerate; and for that more than for his gospel he was condemned to die by the sword.

Perhaps the one man among the Gentiles who put his finger on the danger point in Paul was the silver-smith, Demetrius at Ephesus. On account of Paul's preaching, his trade in silver images of Diana was rapidly declining. Thus, with the keen insight of a tradesman, he saw the implications of Paul's preaching and teaching—that "the temple of the great goddess Diana be made of no account, and that she should even be deposed from her magnificence whom all Asia and the world worshippeth" (Acts 19:27).

The charges both of the witnesses against Stephen (Acts 6:11-14) and of Demetrius against Paul were true—far more than they knew. Neither the Law and the Temple of the Jews nor the Olympian gods and the shrines of the Greeks could withstand the Gospel of Christ and Him crucified.

The final controversy of Paul was not with the Gen-

tiles, but with the Gentile Christians. The Greeks and the Romans had a different background from the Jews. When Paul addressed the people at Lystra, who were ready to worship him and Barnabas, and the Epicureans and Stoics on Mars Hill (Acts 14:11-17; 17:22-34; Rom. 1:18-20), he invariably spoke of the true and living God Who revealed Himself through nature, in distinction from man-made idols, and concluded by proclaiming the judgment of the world in righteousness by the man whom God raised from the dead (Acts 17:31). At this point the Greeks turned a deaf ear to him. Resurrection and judgment were beyond their ken. They would have been perplexed by the words of Peter: "Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you" (Acts 2:22). For, while the Jews sought a sign, the Greeks sought wisdom. The Greeks had, also, a different view of the world, of history, and of the destiny of man. The God of the Jews was personal, righteous will, Who was Lord of nature and of history and performed decisive acts for the advancement of His purpose. The God of Israel went in search of men; the God of the Greeks permitted men to go in search of him. Paul, true to the Hebrew tradition yet breaking with the Hebrew interpretation, regarded the incarnation, death, and resurrection as "central mighty acts of God in time," and the Christians as the "elect people" and heirs with Christ of the consummation. To him all history was controlled by God for a definite end, a series of crises, and a final judgment in which His righteous will is to be manifested to a chosen community upon whose hearts God has written His law. Professor Porter says: "Paul puts Christ and Christians in place

of Law and Israel as the great acts of God through which His purposes for the world are to be fulfilled." ¹⁶

The Greek god never did any mighty acts in behalf of his people as God did at the Red Sea and at Sinai. In the view of the Greeks, history had no divine purpose. They dreamed of an ideal republic or of a cosmopolis, but these were to be achieved by men to whom the gods were more or less favourable. History, therefore, was a meaningless, eternal recurrence, a circular movement emerging from, and submerging into, the vast abyss of the unknown, without a far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves, or without the earnest expectation of the creation waiting for the revealing of the sons of God and the deliverance of the creation from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God (Rom. 8:19-21).

All that the Greek could do was to save himself by detachment from the world in which he was enmeshed. At his best he felt that the natural life was not the ultimate goal of man. To be merely a patriotic citizen of Athens or Sparta did not satisfy him. He had longings for a higher life, for an escape from the limitations of time, from decay and death, and for immortality. For all this, however, he was dependent on himself, without God and without hope in the world.

When Paul began to preach to the Greeks, men were swarming over the empire with panaceas for the ills of life. They were not leaders of insurrection against the Romans like Theudas and Judas, mentioned in Acts 5:36, 37. They offered salvation of a different kind. Among them were the Cynic-Stoic preachers who taught the true, in contrast to the false, good—the inner freedom of the soul. They also trained their disciples in self-sufficiency, self-mastery, and skill in every

virtue. The Neo-Pythagoreans prescribed, and in part practiced, asceticism and vegetarianism. Astrologers offered formulas by which men could free themselves from the grip of fate. Many oriental cults gave assurance of personal immortality to those who were initiated into their mysteries. The synagogues of the Dispersion were conducting active missions among the Gentiles (Matt. 23:15). Almost as many ways of salvation were proposed in Athens, Alexandria, and Rome as are now discussed in New York and Los Angeles; and men listened to them because then as now they were restless without God.

The Greek propagandists regarded themselves as "bearers of a higher mission and as divine envoys who have to observe and watch over mankind, as physicians who must take charge of sick humanity." "Mankind had to be led back from their bustling striving in pursuit of worthless aims to the only care that mattered, their own souls and their real health."¹⁷ Paul's converts from the synagogue were in danger of reverting to Judaism, to the Law and the customs. He admonished the Gentile converts to take heed of those who would make spoil of them through their philosophy and vain deceit, after the traditions of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ (Col. 2:8).

In his letters to the Corinthians Paul met new issues arising in a Greek Christian congregation, issues different from those he discussed in Galatians and Romans. He adapted the Gospel to Greek conditions. Weiss says: "The clash of the Gospel with the ethics and thought of Greece was here brought to a head . . . in very truth the main problems of the new religion were here both practically and theoretically resolved."¹⁸ The Corinthian congregation he treats as converts from

Gentilism (I Cor. 12:2). Once he refers to a minority of Jewish converts (I Cor. 7:18). The Corinthians were not mainly concerned about the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the Law, the Messiah, the righteousness of God. Even if they were taught the Old Testament and its fulfilment in Jesus the Christ, his words did not take root in their hearts. They were far more interested in the relation of Jesus Christ the Lord to the *logos*, the immanent being of the universe, to *sophia*, the wisdom of philosophy, to *gnosis*, the knowledge of mystics,¹⁹ and to the cults through which they were assured of immortality; in how the word of the Cross (I Cor. 1:18) is related to Greek efforts of salvation through the intellect, the feelings, philosophy, ethics, mysteries. These played the same part among the Greeks as did the Law and the promises, the Temple and the sacrifices, among the Jews.²⁰

The contentions which arose among the Christians at Corinth were, therefore, different from those at Jerusalem and at Antioch (Acts 15:1, 5; Gal. 2:3-6). It was not a matter of circumcision and the Law of Moses, but of truth as discovered by the philosophers and symbolized in the mysteries and as now taught by Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ (Acts 15:5). Theology began to sprout (though the word is used neither by Paul nor by any of the other New Testament writers), but it always ended in contentions and divisions. The pride of knowledge is poison to the humility of love. Knowledge puffeth up; love buildeth up (I Cor. 8:2). Paul told the Corinthians plainly that the Gospel or the Christian life is not something to be discussed, or a matter of personal opinion, not *logos*, *sophia*, *gnosis*: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not in wisdom of words, lest the

cross of Christ should be made void" (I Cor. 1:17). Many of them considered the word of the Cross foolishness.

He contrasted the wisdom of God and the wisdom of men, the power of God and the power of men (I Cor. 1:20-25). Christ crucified is the wisdom and the power of God and reveals the love of God which alone saves men from the present evil world and enables them to share in the world to come. Therefore, when Paul became a messenger of glad tidings he differed from all other heralds of salvation, for he determined not to know anything save Christ and Him crucified (I Cor. 2:2). Thus Paul showed the Greeks, as he did the Jews, that Christianity is a religion neither of law, nor of philosophy, nor of mysteries. It is the end of the law, of philosophy, and of cults, because it is love—the kind of love which God revealed in Jesus Christ, which does not deny law, philosophy, or mysteries, but fulfils them. None of them produced Christianity, but Christianity was the answer to the quest of all of them. In the course of history, however, Christianity reverted more or less to law, philosophy, and mystery; it must, therefore, from time to time be delivered from the bondage of these elements, from the rudiments of the world, into the freedom of the sons of God.

Paul was not the originator of missionary work among the Gentiles—even without him Christianity would have extended round the borders of the Mediterranean—but he gave the Gospel of Jesus the form in which it was capable of conquering the world without injury to its own soul. Though he never sat at the feet of the Master, he was the first one among the apostles who understood Him. Body and soul a Jew, having seen Jesus in the heavenly Messiah, born in the Dias-

pora, his horizon was far wider than that of the Twelve. As an apostle of Christ he regarded the history of his own people not as an end in itself but as the preparation for the ecumenical religion of Jesus, the Lord; and the history of the world has since confirmed his judgment.

Paul, in more than one way, became the vessel of God to bear the Gospel to the Gentiles. He made the sole condition of salvation God's grace appropriated by man's faith. Thus he had a message equally applicable to all men, freed from Jewish nationalism and legalism, and from Greek intellectualism and moralism. He boldly declared Christianity a new religion, different in principle from Judaism and paganism, and yet the fulfilment of the best elements, hopes, and aspirations of both.

The issue before the Church today is not essentially different from that before the Church in the first and second centuries. Then the Jewish Christians endeavoured to turn the Gospel into a new law; the Greek Christians, into a new philosophy. Paul proclaimed it as a new life. If it is only a law, however perfect, or only a philosophy, however true, it is a matter for ethical and philosophical schools, not for theological seminaries where men are to be taught glad tidings to be announced to the poor. Christianity fails in its original purpose and loses its power when it ceases to be preached as a message of forgiveness, peace, consolation, inspiration, and hope to the toiling masses burdened by sin, heartbroken, world-weary, despondent, and dying. This has been its strength in the past; this will, doubtless, be its glory in the future. As an ethical religion of redemption Christianity won its way into the Roman Empire in the face of a multitude of relig-

ions and cults which also had the sanctions of divine origin and of centuries of tradition. It had something to offer which the world longed for and had never yet received. Its gospel of grace differentiated it from all other religions. On this point Professor Reitzenstein, writing as a philologist and not as a theologian, gives valuable testimony in his *Poimandres*:

That this redemption [of Christ] was not simply a driving away of evil passions and vices, a deliverance from death and assurance of eternal life, but first of all a forgiveness of sins, appears to me to be that which is new in Christianity. The almost terrifying zeal with which men preached guilt and reconciliation is wanting in Hellenism, so far as I can see. When the early Christians related this sense of guilt, and faith in forgiveness of even the most grievous sins, to the death of Jesus, then, and then only, did the Christian doctrine of a Saviour obtain its unique and its world-conquering power. Its Hellenic rivals could do no more than prepare a way for it in a world in which a sense of sin and guilt had been reawakened.²¹

FOOTNOTES

¹ See Hans Lietzmann, *The Beginnings of the Church* (New York: Scribner, 1937), ch. 6, pp. 112, 118, 126, and the whole chapter. The contrary view in Edman's excellent book, *The Mind of Paul* (New York: Holt, 1935), p. 53. Edman reminds us that the rabbis themselves distinguished seven varieties of Pharisees, p. 55.

² Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. III, ch. 27.

³ In his letters Paul alludes at least three times to his persecution of the Christians: Galatians 1:13; I Corinthians 15:9; Philipians 3:6; all of which confirm the statements in Acts 7:59; 8:1, 3 f.; 9:1-31; 22:4-20; 26:9-11.

⁴ The term "Jesus" falls into the background; the term "Christ" is used most frequently, and "the Lord" one-third as often as "Christos."

⁵ Romans 5:6-8; 8:35-39; II Corinthians 5:14, 15; Colossians 1:13-15; Ephesians 5:1, 2.

⁶ Lake, *Paul*, pp. 87-88, takes the contrary view. So most modern writers on Paul. Lake: "We cannot accept Paul's own ex-

planation of the change which his nature underwent. . . . Paul's experience . . . is not unique;" therefore his "sense that he was 'a new creature'" and of being possessed by God "may be called his 'inspiration' and his 'mysticism.'" Dewey, Lippmann, and perhaps Wieman, no longer feel the need of the term God. This point of view, which for the scientist, philosopher, and historian is undoubtedly logical, was the primary reason for the advent of Kierkegaard and Barth.

⁷ *Science and the Modern World* (New York: Macmillan, 1926), ch. 1.

⁸ See A. E. Taylor, *Francis Bacon* (Oxford University Press, 1926), pp. 5-6. (Annual lecture on a Master Mind, 1926, British Academy.)

⁹ Cf. Acts 28:21.

¹⁰ *The Knowledge of God* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1906), II, 56.

¹¹ Romans 4; 5:12-21; chs. 9-11. See also Galatians. Professor Dodd says of Bousset's *Kurios Christos*, whose theme is that the title "Lord" was derived from Hellenistic sources: "Seldom, I think, has a theory been so widely accepted on more flimsy grounds." (*The Apostolic Preaching*, Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937, pp. 15-16.)

¹² See especially F. C. Porter, *The Mind of Christ in Paul* (New York: Scribner, 1930), pp. 124-126.

¹³ Kirsopp Lake says: Paul "did inherit a belief in the importance of the Law, and neither Jesus nor His disciples are responsible for Paul's change of mind on this subject; for, whereas Jesus differed from other Jews in His interpretation of the Law, Paul differed from them as to its whole function in life." (*Paul*, p. 58.)

¹⁴ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. III, ch. 27.

¹⁵ See A. C. McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought* (New York: Scribner, 1932), I, 28, 29. He seems to take a different view.

¹⁶ *The Mind of Christ in Paul*, p. 126.

¹⁷ Wendland, *Hellenistisch-Römische Kultur*, pp. 75 ff., 82, as quoted in Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*, I, 235; also, Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity* (New York: Putnam, 1904), I, 121-124, chapter on "The Gospel of the Saviour and of Salvation."

¹⁸ *The History of Primitive Christianity*, I, 293.

¹⁹ The Greek considered *gnosis* as revealed knowledge but, unlike that of the Hebrews, metaphysical by nature, an answer to the problems raised by philosophers. Thus, while *gnosis* was not philosophy, it served the same purpose and was determined by the same interests. See E. F. Scott, *The New Testament Idea of Revelation* (New York: Scribner, 1935), pp. 116-125.

²⁰ See Weiss, *op. cit.*, I, 292 f.

²¹ Quoted in Heinrich Weinelt, "Ist unsere Verkündigung von Jesus unhaltbar geworden?" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1910, p. 37 f. (Translated by G. W. R.)

IV

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ACTION AND IN DEFINITION

"But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me."—JOHN 15:26.

Modern philosophers have found little or no place in their thinking for the Holy Spirit of the New Testament and of the creeds of the Church. They reduce Him to the spirit of man—his intellect, will, and feeling, one or all—in intensified action. He, or it, is not more than "a resistless natural force which runs athwart the regular course of knowledge and the normal exercise of the will."¹ Kant excludes the Holy Spirit from human life when he says: "We can neither recognize a supersensible object within our experience, nor exercise any influence upon it." Hegel is said to have made the Holy Spirit equivalent to the spirit of logic, and its resemblance to the Holy Spirit of Christian doctrine only nominal. Rudolf Eucken regards God as "spirit"; the Holy Spirit as an inner distinction within God he does not discuss.

The modern theologians, beginning with Schleiermacher, seem not to have gone far beyond the philosophers in their doctrine of the Holy Spirit. True, Schleiermacher says, "Nothing less than the Divine being was in Christ, and dwells in the Christian Church as its unifying Spirit." Mackintosh, however, raises the question, not without reason: Was Schleiermacher's description of the Holy Spirit as "the common Spirit

of the Christian society," interpreted as analogous to the spirit of a race or people, the same Being as the New Testament called the Spirit of God? ² Ritschl claimed that "no point in theology has been so steadily neglected as the conception of the Holy Spirit." ³ Mackintosh adds: "It must be regretfully confessed that He Himself has done all too little to supply the want."

Scholarly attempts have been made from the viewpoint of the comparative study of religions to account for the mysterious presence and working of the Holy Spirit by finding in pagan religions and cults similar phenomena caused by demons, gods, and spirits. ⁴ The results of these studies have not satisfactorily accounted for the conception of the Holy Spirit in the Old and the New Testaments and in the experience of the Church. Of "the idea of the One Undivided Essence, subsisting eternally after a threefold manner and in a threefold relation," one finds only very partial analogies in man's nature or in finite being. "In the things of God we speak as children, and we shall continue to do so until 'that which is perfect is come.' " Yet our imperfect terms such as "hypostasis" and "persona" represent eternal verities (Swete). ⁵

The philosophers and the theologians of the pre-war period were perplexed and irritated not a little by a new approach, which was more than a revival of the old, to the definition of the Holy Spirit. Then a young and comparatively little known minister of Switzerland, who is now a theologian of world-wide reputation, affirmed that the content of theology should be the revelation of God through His word and that from

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 125.

the beginning God is revealed as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In his "Christliche Dogmatik" Barth begins his discussion of God not with manitou, gods, consciousness of the infinite in man, but with the Trinity; his premise is that if we are to expound revelation we must begin with the Triune God. According to the Bible, the veiled God is unveiled and imparted; the Father is disclosed in the Son and communicated in the Spirit; and in these three characters the one God is made known in the Lord. While Barth accepts the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, he interprets the article on the Holy Ghost not in metaphysical terms. He guards against both tritheism and unitarianism when he starts with the definition of God in John's First Epistle, 4:8, "God is love," a love without beginning. "In God Himself it is the love of the Father to the Son, of the Son to the Father. This eternal *love in God Himself* is the Holy Spirit."⁶ The love that is in God, unchanging and primordial, manifests itself to us in the mystery and miracle of "the new birth"—in other words, becomes visible to us.

Between the method of approach to reality of the so-called modernists or liberals and that of Barth and his associates there is a wide difference. The former begin with matter, with "specks of electrified ether" and with chromosomes, to explain the universe, man, and God; the latter begin with God, God as revealed in the Scriptures. The battle between the two groups will continue until they come to agreement on the theory of knowledge—whether there is a way from man to God or whether the only way is from God to man. Few of us will see the end of this epistemological war.⁷

In view of this introductory statement, one must

distinguish between a spirit pervading the cosmos—matter and man—and the Holy Spirit active in the prophets, the Christ, and the Church. Both are of God, but they manifest God in different ways. It is not possible to ascend in the course of ages from the cosmic and the human spirit to the Christian spirit: that is, to the Holy Spirit Who came from God into the prophets, dwelt in the Christ, proceeded from the Father and the Son upon the disciples on Pentecost so that “they were all filled with the Holy Spirit” (Acts 5:3; 5:31; 10:34).

Primitive man, roaming in forests, over mountains, by the seaside, on the desert, felt himself in the presence of a mysterious power emanating from things above, beneath, and around him. He faced tempest, earthquake, pestilence, floods, the silence of the starry heavens, the calm of noon, fruit-bearing shrubs and trees, the vitalizing warmth and light of the sun, and breathed the invigorating ozone of the air. He called this mysterious force “mana” or “manitou.” It was helpful and harmful; it hurt and it healed; it built up and it tore down; it killed and it made alive. It was the wisdom of the sage, the courage of the warrior, the fear of the coward. In his crude way man tried to control it for his own advantage, to enter into alliance with that which was helpful and to escape in one way or another that which was harmful. By instinct he attempted to “subdue” the earth (Gen. 1:28).

Time came when “mana” was turned into a power pervading the universe, somewhat as the anima, or soul, dwells in the body; hence the animistic view of the world. Man projected himself into his environment. Without understanding the technical terms, he perceived the macrocosm in the microcosm. He caught

glimpses of his own image and likeness in the heavens above us and on the earth beneath. He animated and personalized everything, and eventually concluded that there was one person over all things. But neither animistic religion nor philosophic monotheism provides for the Holy Spirit who proceedeth from the Father and the Son. One wonders at times whether the myth does not convey more of the mystery of the universe than the chemical formula, the astronomical laws, or the speculations of philosophies; and regrets that the heaven that lies about us in our infancy so quickly fades into the light of common day.

In an article in the *Hibbert Journal*, Horace Thoroughood quotes these words of Sir Francis Younghusband: "But of the existence of *a* Holy Spirit, radiating upward through all animate beings, and finding its fullest expression in man in love, and in the flowers in beauty, we can be as certain as of anything in the world. This fiery spiritual impulsion in the centre and the source of things, ever burning in us, is the supremely important factor in our existence."⁸ Those words might have been written by Rousseau or Goethe. They define original animism in beautiful phrase with content that wins the approval of modern man. It is a romantic and an æsthetic conception of the universe and of human life. Yet we are not convinced that "*a* Holy Spirit radiating upward through all animate beings" is the same as *the* Holy Spirit who is revealed in the Old Testament and the New Testament. It is doubtless the cosmic spirit, which is not necessarily in contradiction with the Holy Spirit of the Apostles' Creed, but differs from Him as Jesus Christ differs from poets, philosophers, and founders of religion—a difference not only in degree but in kind.

Although "mana," or the force pervading the universe, came to be thought of in terms of personality, one misses the mark when one tries to explain the spirit of the Lord as being an evolution out of the "fiery impulsion in the centre and source of things." The attempt to account for *the* Holy Spirit of the threefold benediction of "the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit" through the immanent view of the universe, emergent evolution, and the monistic conception of the world is always fatal to religion and directly contrary to revelation. The Holy Spirit is far more than a "Christian version of the primitive notion of *mana* or mysterious supernatural power," as Professor H. L. Barnes⁹ characterizes it; his, however, is the only conclusion that one can reach when one bases the explanation of all phenomena in the life of man upon the premises of the chemist and the biologist.

Between the spirit of nature and man and the Holy Spirit there is not continuity but discontinuity. The one does not gradually evolve out of the other; the natural mind of man will not by education and moral effort blossom into the mind of Christ. Between the two there is a gap, somewhat like that between the crystal and the rosebush, which can be bridged only by a creative act of God. Nor does the Holy Spirit lie latent in the subconscious mind and on occasion rise from the subliminal regions of the soul into conscious mind. Experiences of this sort men have regarded as inspiration and revelation. Among pagans, ancient and modern, "all moods of ecstasy and lofty emotion implied an actual possession by a divinity."¹⁰ They have come to poets, painters, sculptors, philosophers, and mystics, who affirm the identity of the divine and

the human and deny the transcendence of God, not in space but in spirit and purpose, and fail to recognize man's alienation from God through sin and the necessity of man's reconciliation to God (II Cor. 5:20). Never can a sheer equation be made between the movements of God's Spirit and the human spirit; and never is there a direct continuity so that the spirit of man grows into the Spirit of God as the sapling grows into the tree.

Everything which the apostles, who speak to us in the New Testament, the great Church Fathers, or the creeds of the churches from the Apostles' Creed down to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession, wanted to express is this one thing: that into the world of men with their ethics, their metaphysics, and their religions, there has entered something different, something which is distinguished not gradually or quantitatively, but qualitatively and fundamentally, from everything which man can know from himself outward. And that something is the Word of God.¹¹

Yet when all this is affirmed, it does not follow that the Spirit of God is not in man, striving with him as a creature of flesh (Gen. 6:3). He is present, however, in the "supra-conscious," in that element which is above the conscious and into which, in times of need, the mind rises through acts of decision and commitment which are equivalent to faith working in love in spite of a sceptical and hateful world. In this way the Holy Spirit, in other words, the supernatural, is in man at all times; though man be faithless God is faithful and will never abandon His own. Man becomes conscious of the Spirit of God by walking in the way of Jesus, by deciding for the purpose of God, by

self-surrender of faith, which comes with the divine call. He is never absent, though His presence is not recognized by men. Were He absent, He could not manifest Himself to man nor be present in crises.¹²

Spengler, in his *Decline of the West*, makes a distinction between "truth" men and "fact" men. Jesus was a "truth" man, metaphysical to the core of His being. Historical actuality had no meaning for Him, for His inner life was wholly lived in the invisible other world; and He never supposed for one moment that He could influence the course of history. He did not aim to alter, to improve, or to reform, but to abrogate history. The fundamental thing that Spengler lacks in a true interpretation of history is faith in the Holy Spirit Who as transcendent and super-historical power and person enters history and gives it meaning, direction, and goal. For history has meaning and value only when it is seen in the light of Jesus Christ and of the Kingdom of God, which can be apprehended and understood only through the Holy Spirit. He stands in judgment on history, delivers it from futility, and fills it with significance in relation to the Kingdom of God. The creative activity of God will not permit merely cyclic recurrence or an evolution of immanent laws and forces in nature and man; history ends when eternity, which came into time in Christ, will take the place of time.¹³

What is the Holy Spirit as described in the Old Testament and the New and as later set forth in the creeds of the Church? Without a clear conception of His nature and function, Christians are always liable to err in several ways. They fall into the error of dogmatism, ritualism, and legalism, run into the vagaries of fanaticism, or end in humanism. All of which resolve

the Holy Spirit into an intensified activity of the reason (rationalism), or of the will (moralism), or of the feelings (mysticism). The Spirit of God is assumed to be the equivalent of the spirit of man at his best.

True, the Holy Spirit is an object of faith, as are the Father and the Son, each of whom is historically and psychologically inexplicable. Yet He enters into the life of man as motive and works effectively for the purpose of God. We can discern His activity, the conditions and mode of His operation.

As there are remnants of Semitic polytheism and henotheism in the Old Testament, which are the background but not the source of the ethical monotheism of the prophets, so there are traces of the view of the spirit held by primitive man. The Hebrew word for spirit is *ruah*; the Greek, *pneuma*; the Latin, *spiritus*. Each originally means wind, breath, and later was applied to soul, the disposition and the will of men, and in religious usage came to be applied to the gods or to God. Even in its earliest meaning spirit in the Old Testament is related to God. It was regarded as a power before it was considered a person. It came upon and took hold of men sporadically and intermittently. Thus Samson was enabled to rend the lion and to slay the Philistines; David performed deeds of valour; Gideon led an army to victory; Joseph interpreted dreams. Prophetic bands were driven into frenzy. Saul himself, without his will, came under the influence of the prophetic spirit. At this stage it was a force that came from God, without personal or ethical character. All sorts of abnormal actions, madness, physical strength, ecstasy, were supposed to be the work of a spirit other than man and in some form belonging to the divine.

With the ethical monotheism of the prophets, who proclaimed God as a person holy and righteous, the conception of the Spirit of God changed correspondingly. The Spirit partook of the attributes of God. Revelation itself was nothing else than the mind of God disclosing itself through His Spirit. He is the agency of God in creation as well as in revelation. Through it God works upon matter and mind. "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" (Gen. 1:2) and brought cosmos out of chaos, order out of confusion. This means far more than primitive man's conception of creation or than the scientific evolutionary hypothesis of the modern man. It is more than nonsense or than science. It is a revelation of God in His creative activity. Only when we read the first verses of Genesis in the light of the third verse of the Prologue of John's Gospel—"All things were made through him"—and of the introduction of the First Epistle of John—"That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes . . . concerning the Word of Life"—will we comprehend the wisdom of Genesis, which neither the primitive man nor the modern scientist can understand.

The Spirit of God came upon the prophets: "The Lord Jehovah hath spoken; who can but prophesy?" (Amos 3:8). The prophet announced that the "spirit of the Lord shall rest" upon "the shoot out of the stock of Jesse," "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of Jehovah" (Isa. 11:2). Through the Spirit of Jehovah the character of His Servant is revealed, in Whom one cannot draw a line of division between God and His Spirit and the man

who "hath no form nor comeliness" (Isa. 53:2). In the Old Testament the Spirit always manifests itself in and through persons, and works toward exceptional action in the life of humanity. Men of leadership among the Hebrews, kings, prophets, and sages, and the coming Messiah, are recipients of the Spirit. "Storm and lightning, the motion of the stars and the manifold life of nature are attributed to God; they are never related to the Spirit of God."

In the first three Gospels and in Acts the Spirit is still regarded as "Force," "the power of the Most High." It "descends upon," "fills," men and women, and inspires them to speak in His name and to serve Him and their fellow men. The Spirit "descended upon Jesus," the man "from Nazareth of Galilee" (Mark 1:9, 10). At the same time "a voice came out of the heavens," saying, "Thou art my beloved Son" (verse 11). Henceforth Jesus was the man of the Spirit, living the life of the Spirit of God in human form, the life of the Son of God among men. Mark wrote his Gospel to convince men that Jesus was the Christ, the anointed of God, in and through Whom the Holy Spirit was revealed. John wrote his Gospel to convince men that Jesus was the Word become flesh and therefore the light that lighteth every man.

Jesus alludes to the Holy Spirit only five times, including the triune formula in Matthew 28:19. In each of the other four passages the Spirit is represented as a divine power working in and through men, also in and through Jesus Himself, enabling Him to do wonderful works. A river running low in winter may rise in volume when it is fed by the streams and rivulets that flow from the melting snows and mountain springs until it breaks over its banks and floods the surround-

ing fields. So Jesus, who lived the ordinary life of a carpenter of Nazareth, now that He was filled with the Spirit could not live His life in the customary forms of the flesh and the conventional order of Judaism. The immediate outcome was Calvary.

The same Spirit that came upon Jesus came also upon His disciples on the day of Pentecost. They received "power" (Acts 1:8). They spoke "with other tongues" (2:4). "They spake the word of God with boldness" (4:31). They wrought many signs and wonders among the people (5:12). They healed the sick and raised the dead. "They continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers" (2:42). They "took their food with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God, and having favour with all the people" (2:46, 47). They held their possessions in common and "parted them to all, according as any man had need" (2:45, 46). Above all, they believed that "this Jesus whom ye crucified" "God hath made both Lord and Christ" (2:36). Paul, also, did missionary work among the Gentiles "in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Holy Spirit" (Rom. 15:19), which he regarded as part of the regular work of the Church. The possession of the Spirit was evidence that the new age was at hand (Acts 2:17-21).

While the same Spirit that came upon Jesus in baptism filled the disciples on Pentecost, it now had new content. In the former instance it was the Spirit of the Father descending upon the Son; now it is the Spirit of the Father proceeding through the Son. In the words of Paul, "God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying, Abba, Father" (Gal. 4:6). Jesus, Who was *with* men in the flesh, is now *in* men

in the Spirit. They lived their lives in a new way. Through Jesus they had a vision of God which inspired them with new hope, with victorious faith, and with serving and sacrificing love. They had the substance, but not the form, of a new theology, sociology, and eschatology.

Pentecost is considered the birthday of the Church; for from that day forth the disciples of Jesus were a new people, "a third race," not Jews nor Gentiles, not of the world though in it; they were "sojourners and pilgrims," "an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession" (I Pet. 2:9). Pentecost was as much a new creative act of God as the cosmos, the first Adam, the second Adam, none of which science and philosophy can comprehend or describe. The activity of the Spirit is always a creative act, a miracle, not to be explained by historical continuity, but by transcendent discontinuity; faith only can apprehend Him.

Professor Bacon says: "The beginning of our religion was the doctrine of the Spirit as an affluence from the risen Jesus." The Church was not founded upon dogmas about God, Christ, and men, not upon ritual or worship, a code of laws or a form of government. It had its beginning historically with men and women, common folk without education or culture but filled with the Spirit of Christ. Not one of Jesus' followers claimed to have the Spirit until He had risen and ascended.

While the first Christians lived in the Spirit, it remained for Paul to define the relation of the Holy Spirit to Christ, to the Church, and to the Christian. This he could do because the Spirit laid hold on him in a unique way. He ascribed to the Jewish and the

early Christian conception of the Spirit such characteristics as belong to personality—initiative, purposive action, and ethical ideals.

He clarifies the meaning of the Spirit in a concrete way when he says: "The Lord is the Spirit"; and the Lord is Jesus risen and ascended. We know the Lord of glory through Jesus of Galilee. To have the Spirit of the Lord is to have the Spirit of "Jesus of Nazareth, anointed by God with the Holy Ghost and with power," Who "went about doing good, preaching good tidings of peace, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil" (Acts 10:36-38). The nearest equivalent of Paul's admonition in Ephesians, "Be filled with the Spirit," is the exhortation in Philippians: "Have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus" (2:5). In I Corinthians 2:16 he writes: "But we have the mind of Christ." In his prayer for the Ephesian Christians Paul beseeches the Father, "that Christ may dwell in your hearts through faith" (3:17). His prayer in Colossians 1:9 explains what the Apostle means by the mind of Christ: "that ye may be filled with the knowledge of his will in all spiritual wisdom and understanding, etc." A passage that is the parallel of the injunction, "Be filled with the Spirit," and that throws light upon this imperative, is found in Colossians in a somewhat different form: "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." Accordingly we are safe in assuming, in the light of Paul's words, that the one Spirit that abides in the one body which is His Church and in which the individual members of the body share is equivalent to the "mind of Christ." When Paul coined an appropriate phrase, "fellowship of the Spirit" (Phil. 2:1), he simply gave a name to what existed from the beginning of the Church on Pentecost.¹⁴

What did Paul mean by the mind of Christ? What does the mind of Christ mean to us? How may we obtain the mind of Christ and thus "be filled with the Spirit"?

In Philippians 2:5-8, after the Apostle admonishes the reader to "have this mind in you which was also in Christ Jesus," he proceeds to define the phrase in terms of what Jesus was, what He became, and what He did. He was on an equality with God. He renounced His divine dignity and became man in the form of a servant; He humbled Himself and became obedient even unto death, yea the death of the Cross. In other words, by self-renunciation, humility, obedience, service, sacrifice, motivated by love for sinful men, He saved men from their sins and gave them power to become sons of God. For this God highly exalted Him to be head of all things in heaven, on earth, and under the earth. The mind of Christ does not imply primarily great knowledge—scientific, philosophical, historical—but abounding love, the quality of love which is manifested in the life and death of Jesus Christ, "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord," from which, Paul was persuaded, "neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us" (Rom. 8:38, 39).

The mind of Christ may be defined in another way. The quality of a man's mind is determined by his *attitude* and *disposition* toward the ultimate realities of life, which are God, man, and the world. In these relations Jesus lived in a way that made Him *like* men and yet *different* from men; He was the man above men because He lived a life new in quality among men.

He was always spontaneously the reverent, obedient Son of His heavenly Father. His sense of God's fatherhood, of being sent of God, of continuously working with God for the achievement of His purpose, of loyalty to God's will, and of God's sustaining power was the fontal source of His unparalleled life and work.

His disposition toward God was at the same time the spirit of His life toward men—the spirit of love that served, sacrificed, and died for men. By the free necessity of love He preached, taught, and healed. He gave sight to the blind, made the lame walk, cleansed the lepers, opened the ears of the deaf, raised up the dead, and preached glad tidings to the poor. Never did a man do more so-called humanitarian works than Jesus. Yet while He helped men He felt that He was glorifying God. He could not separate the service of men and the glory of God; they were two sides of one divine human life.

In relation to the world of things, the vast world of impersonal things that plays so large a part in every man's life, Jesus was not an ascetic, for He came both eating and drinking. He was not a libertine, for while He was in the world He was not of it. He was master of things and put them into use for the enrichment of life through the realization of ideals that belong to the spaceless and timeless order.

The mind includes the whole life of man—what he thinks, what he aspires to, what he works for, what he lives for, the purpose that controls life, the actuating motives, the ultimate goal. These are the elements that make a world, when the word is used not in a material but in a spiritual sense. In these respects Jesus not only rose high above men, but in the

quality of His life *contradicted* the life of man. He was the man of the Spirit; He had the mind of God.

When I attended last year's convocation of the alumni of Knox College, Toronto, these very pertinent questions were asked in the discussion of a paper: How are we to determine what is actually the work of the Holy Spirit? How can we tell the spurious from the authentic activity of the Spirit, the cosmic and the human from the Holy Spirit, fanatical outburst from the legitimate fruits of the Spirit? These are not new questions. Even in the early Church men were told to prove the Spirit (I John 4:1; The Didache XI). Different tests were proposed. The present vague and undefined conception of the Holy Spirit makes an answer to these questions even more difficult than of old. The test of the Spirit's presence now is to be found in the character and life of Jesus; He lends concrete content to the Spirit. What Jesus did in Palestine, His attitude and disposition toward God, men, and things, He now is and does as Lord through His spirit in His body, the Church. Every spirit that makes for the full life of man—body, mind, and heart—that helps men to live godly, righteously, and soberly in this present evil world, and thus confirms a man's confession that Jesus is Lord—that is evidence of the presence of the Holy Spirit.

To have the attitude and disposition of Jesus is to have the "mind of Christ," to "be filled with the Spirit," to be headed toward God and eternity, and to be on the way of the abundant life. It does not, however, imply that one has already attained "the stature of the fulness of Christ." Then there were, as there are now, "babes in Christ" and "full-grown men in Christ." The babes were fed "with milk," the full-

grown men "with meat" (I Cor. 3:2). Paul prayed "that we may be no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, but, speaking truth in love, may grow up in all things unto him" (Eph. 4:14, 15).

The mind of Christ, the life in the Spirit, is, like a harvest of wheat, both a divine gift and a human achievement. Men cannot have it unless God gives it; God cannot give it unless men attain it. This is one of the paradoxes of the Christian life.

There have been men and women in the centuries of Christian history who claimed perfection because they received the Holy Spirit—perfection in conduct and in knowledge of the things of God and of man. In that direction fanaticism lies. The Holy Spirit has been made responsible for all sorts of vagaries and fancies of men. The mind of Christ is far more than the mind of man developed by education, culture, and the experience of life. To pass from the natural mind to the mind of the Spirit a deep inward transformation is indispensable. When Jesus proclaimed the nearness of the Kingdom of God, He also announced its distance, which can be overcome only when one fulfils the mandate of God through Christ and His Spirit: "Repent ye and believe the Gospel." The Greek imperative for "repent" means "change your mind." To Nicodemus Jesus said: "Except one be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). This is a paradox which perplexed "the teacher of Israel." Paul makes it clear in Romans 12:2 that the mind of Christ is the natural mind transformed so that it is no longer "fashioned according to this world" but renewed so as to be capable of "proving what is the good and acceptable will of God."

Serious misunderstanding of the nature of the Spirit and of its way of working will be avoided if one will distinguish, as Paul does, between its abiding presence in the Church and its specific operations in the members of the Church.

True, there are many expressions in the New Testament which indicate that the Spirit comes down upon (Acts 1:8), falls on (10:44), is poured forth (2:17, 18), lays hold of (8:39), fills (9:17), men individually or in groups. The way of its coming suggests the descent of something coming from above and filling someone below, the pouring of the content of one vessel into another. The Spirit is, also, imparted by the laying on of hands (Acts 8:17; 19:6; I Tim. 4:14). While Peter was preaching in the house of Cornelius "the Holy Spirit fell on all them that heard the word" (Acts 10:44). In Acts 5:32 we are told God gave the Holy Spirit "to them that obey him." Paul asks the Galatians: "Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?" (3:2). Some of these passages readily lend themselves to a mechanical and ritualistic view of the impartation of the Spirit. The Spirit's activity as described in the New Testament is not limited to only one way; it worketh when and where and how it pleaseth. In its motions and operations it is comparable to the "wind" that "bloweth where it will." There are "diversities of workings, but the same God, who worketh all things in all" (I Cor. 12:6). The one thing, however, that is clear is that in all the various descriptions of the Spirit's coming it is from another than natural or human source. It is not the spirit of the cosmic order about us nor of the psychic man within us. It is *from above, from God*, and through its coming and presence it endues men

with divine power which they do not naturally possess. "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you" (Acts 1:8).

Alongside of its occasional and sporadic coming and activity the New Testament also represents the Holy Spirit as a permanent and abiding presence. It came upon Jesus in His baptism and upon the disciples at Pentecost. Ever after His baptism Jesus was anointed of God, was the man of the Spirit. To say of Him, as the Jews did, "He hath an unclean spirit," was to "blaspheme against the Holy Spirit" (Mark 3:29, 30). "By the Spirit of God He "cast out demons" (Matt. 12:28). After Pentecost the disciples were the fellowship or community of the Spirit. They lived, walked, worked, and prayed in the Spirit. When Ananias and Sapphira lied to the apostles, they were told by Peter that they "lie to the Holy Spirit" (Acts 5:3, 9).

Paul and John in their writings set forth the permanency of the Spirit's presence, with which goes the idea of the personality of the Spirit. John tells us how Jesus, when the disciples were grieved because He was about to leave them, comforted them: "I will pray the Father and he shall give you another comforter that he may be with you forever" . . . "for he abideth with you and shall be in you" (John 14:16, 17): "He will teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you" (John 14:26). Paul defines the Church as "one body and one Spirit" (Eph. 4:4). "Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (I Cor. 12:27). The Spirit is to the members of the Church what the soul is to the members of the body. As each member of the human body is pervaded by the soul, so each member of the Church shares in the power of the Spirit. To carry the analogy

further, in the human body the members have different functions to perform, some "more honourable," some "less honourable," and each member is vitalized by one soul; so in the body of Christ, the Church, there are many members, with divers functions, some more, others less, prominent, yet each is sustained by the one Spirit. "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit" (I Cor. 12:12, 13).

In the light of the permanent presence of the Spirit of Christ, *i.e.*, "the mind of Christ," we shall have to explain the special gifts, or charisms, of the Spirit. Paul draws a fine distinction between the "one Spirit" and "spiritual gifts." The latter are functional and are distributed among the members of the Church on the basis, doubtless, of their native talents. "There are diversities of gifts" (I Cor. 12:4) and "to each one is given the manifestation of the Spirit to *profit* withal" (12:7). The gifts are enumerated as follows: the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge, faith, gifts of healing, working of miracles, prophecy, discerning of spirits, divers kinds of tongues, interpretation of tongues. "But all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will" (see I Cor. 12:4-11).

In addition to these more or less transient gifts, Paul cites, also, definite functions performed by certain persons through the Spirit: "And he gave some to be apostles . . . and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers . . . unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ" (Eph. 4:11, 12;

I Cor. 12:28). These gifts were specific manifestations of the ever-present Spirit in the individual members for mutual edification. They may be termed the evangelistic and edifying operations of the Spirit. Without the Spirit's presence in the Church as a body, the spiritual gifts could not have been given to particular members.

At Corinth Paul had to guard the Church against the abuse of spiritual gifts, especially those of a more spectacular kind, like speaking with tongues. The members desired to make a display of their gifts, to magnify themselves rather than to edify the Church. They became proud of their gifts, which were supposed to be evidences of superior spirituality. After giving due recognition to these extraordinary gifts and claiming even to "speak with tongues more than you all" (I Cor. 14:18), Paul exhorts them to "desire earnestly the greater gifts" (I Cor. 12:31), "to follow after love" (I Cor. 14:1). He points them to "a most excellent way" (I Cor. 12:31). That was the "way" he wrote of in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, the way of faith, hope, love; "the greatest of these is love." These three abide and are the perennial fruit of the Spirit in the lives of individual members of the Church of every age and land. They are the distinctive qualities of the "mind of Christ" begotten in the believer by the Spirit of Christ.

The effect of the Spirit in the lives of those who "walk in the Spirit" is defined more in detail in other passages of Paul. In Galatians 5:22 he says: "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, meekness, temperance." In Ephesians 5:9 he writes: "The fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness, righteousness, truth." The

Spirit is represented to be "advocate," "comforter," "teacher," "reminder of things of Christ," "helper," "guide," "giver of power." "The Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God;" and "God reveals unto us through the Spirit"

*"Things which eye saw not, and ear heard not,
And which entered not into the heart of man,
Whatsoever things God prepared for them
that love him" (I Cor. 2:9, 10).*

The Spirit "maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God" (Rom. 8:27).

If the possession of the Spirit is equivalent to having the "mind of Christ," namely, the attitude and disposition of a son toward God, of a brother toward man, of a master toward things, with the controlling purpose of attaining "life to the full," then one will freely bear the fruit of the Spirit in the form of life of the age in which one lives, whether it be ancient, medieval, or modern. The manner of life will differ widely in different ages but the Spirit is always the same. The man of the Spirit is not slavishly bound by dogmas, institutions, laws, rituals, though he may use all of them. Nor is the motive or purpose of his life changed by changes of world view, by new interpretations of the universe by science and philosophy. He is bound only by his *disposition* and his *purpose*. He is capable of adjusting himself to all kinds of new knowledge, to new methods of working, but he will never change his disposition and purpose.

The life in the Spirit is absolute only in the eternal purpose—the abundant life lived in the threefold relation of son, brother, master of things; *the life in the Spirit is forever relative in the degree of its realization,*

in knowledge of God and man and the world, in ways of living, in the practical application of the ideals of the Spirit. Paul was emphatic in his affirmation of relativity. "Brethren," he said, "I count not myself yet to have laid hold." But he was equally positive about the absoluteness of the purpose: "I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." He adds the very significant words: "Only whereunto we have attained, by that same rule let us walk" (Phil. 3:13-16). Our relative achievements are the measure of our responsibility to move forward and upward to the absolute idea. Indeed, the only man who is free is he who has the Spirit of God. The apostle justly gloried in his liberty when he wrote exultingly: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty"—liberty to live the complete life, the life of truth, which alone is freedom and leads to the life that is "life to the full." It is not the license of the Stoic "as you will"; it is the freedom to do what is pleasing to God and serves the eternal welfare of men.

How may *we* fulfil Paul's admonition, "Be filled with the Spirit"? We cannot fill ourselves with it; we can only put ourselves in the way of being filled by it. If a man desires to be filled with pure air, he goes to the fields, the hilltops, the mountains, breathes deeply and feels the invigorating draughts of ozone. He cannot create the air but he puts himself in the way of being filled with it. If he feels the need of the light and warmth of the sun, he will not hide in a cave or lie in the shade of the woods, but will go into the open and let the sun's rays beat upon him. He cannot create the sun's rays but he can put himself in the way of the light and warmth of the sun.

If one is to "be filled with the Spirit," one must go where the Spirit is. He is not far off; He is accessible to everyone. We need not ascend to heaven to bring Christ down; we need not descend into the abyss to bring Christ up from the dead. "The word is nigh thee, in thy mouth, and in thy heart" (Rom. 10:7, 8). However, the Spirit is not visible, like the mountains or the valley, the sun or the stars. He is invisible, like the air around us. Jesus says "the world beholdeth him not," *i.e.*, "the Spirit of Truth" (John 14:17). He becomes manifest unto those who keep the word of Jesus and give proof of their love for Him. Judas was perplexed by this statement and cried: "What is come to pass that thou wilt manifest thyself unto us, and not unto the world?" Judas is a type of the natural man, everywhere and always, who is blind to the contradiction between the world and the "Spirit of Truth." Only those who have Jesus' word and His Spirit in them can catch at least a glimpse of the enormous significance of Judas' question.

Jesus' answer to the question is equally profound: "If a man love me he will keep my word; and my Father will love him and we will come unto him and make our abode with him" (John 14:23). Because the world does not love Jesus or keep His word, the Father and the Son cannot abide in it; Jesus, *i.e.*, the Christ according to the Spirit, cannot manifest Himself to it. The Spirit will not come into an empty vessel, into a person who does not have spiritual capacity or does not already have a spark of the Spirit, who does not lean toward God, and who does not have the desire to obey Christ and the readiness to serve Him in love. He guides the seeker, He teaches the disciple, He helps the helper, He comforts the mourner, He is paraclete to

the runner in the race of life, He prays for those who pray, He works in the worker.

Men are helped to "be filled with the Spirit" by preaching, by teaching God in Christ, by living in His Spirit in all the relations of individual and social life. Merely "special preaching, in which the person and work of the Holy Spirit are carefully and courageously pressed," will be of little avail. One cannot impart or receive the Spirit in so easy a way. The medium through which the Spirit is communicated to others is the Spirit-filled community of Spirit-filled men and women living and walking and working together in the love of God manifested in Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

In the first generation of believers, "faith in the God of Israel became faith in God the Father; to which were added faith in Jesus, the Christ and the Son of God, and the witness of the gift of the Holy Spirit, that is, of the Spirit of God in Christ."¹⁵ The Spirit was conceived as an effluence or an influence from God, a power in men enabling them to bear witness to Christ and to continue the work which He did among men. Paul still uses the terms Spirit of God and Spirit of Christ interchangeably.

Again, the Spirit is represented as a person with the purpose of the Lord; the Lord is the Spirit. In the New Testament He is presented as belonging to the divine sphere. True, in the introductory addresses of the epistles, in which God and Christ are invoked as the source of grace and peace, the Spirit is never named as an associate of God and Christ. But in other passages He is on an equality with God: "The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all" (II Cor.

13:14). So, also, in Matthew 28:19: "Baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Likewise in John 15:26: "But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me." The triune baptismal formula is recorded also in the *Didache* VII; in I Clement 38, and in Ignatius to the Ephesians 9. Through the mystery of the Spirit it was supposed the redemption in Christ was applied to the believer.

That Jesus was the Son of the Father became a mark of the true faith of the ancient Church. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit as God *grew apace* with the doctrine of the deity of Jesus. Doubtless Paul and John led the way to a trinitarian conception of God; but it required centuries to work out an authoritative dogma of the co-equality and co-eternity of the Spirit. Not even Paul among the early Christians identified Jesus Christ as God; among the Greek Christians both the identity and the difference were maintained by equating the Logos of God with the divine in Jesus. The deity of the Spirit was a logical inference from the deity of Jesus. The trinity of the Godhead was the experience of Christians before it was formulated into a dogma of the Church. In revelation God is Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

The baptismal symbol of Rome (ca. A.D. 150) closes with the words: "And in the holy spirit, the holy church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of flesh." The creedal formulas of individuals or of churches current before the Nicene Creed have the threefold division of the baptismal mandate in Matthew's Gospel: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Sabellius

regarded God the Father and the Son and the Spirit *successively* as divine; Athanasius *simultaneously*, each of the three co-equal and co-eternal.¹⁶ Only in the Creed of Constantinople (A.D. 381) did the entire paragraph of the Creed appear for the first time. The Holy Spirit is defined as "the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake through the Prophets." This was to settle finally the controversy about the Holy Spirit that was waged at that time.¹⁷ The Roman Catholic Church added, and the churches of the Reformation accepted, the word *filioque*, which meant that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. This addition was sanctioned by the Council of Toledo, A.D. 589; in the ninth century it was generally received throughout the West; and to this day it is the main doctrinal difference between the Orthodox and the Roman Catholic Church.

The fact that the third part of the creed is introduced by *credo*, "I believe," indicates that here, as in the first and second parts, we have to do with man, but man as revealed in and through the Holy Spirit. So, also, the Father is revealed in the Son through the Holy Spirit. This is not a philosophical doctrine of man or a scientific anthropology but man's question in relation to God and Christ and what happens to man through the Holy Spirit: the Church, forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, the eternal life—all these are mediated to us through the Holy Spirit,¹⁸ Who works faith in our hearts through the preaching of the Holy Gospel and confirms it by the use of the Holy Sacraments.¹⁹ The result is a life working in faith, labouring in love with the patience of hope. "Accordingly,

he who *believes* knows that even this is God's work and gift."

This is today, as it has been in every age of the Church, the one safeguard against a petrified orthodoxy, a magical sacramentalism, and humanism in its intellectual, moral, and mystical forms. It exalts the preaching mission of the Church, faith as a divine act in man, and the Christian life as controlled by the Spirit of Christ in all its individual and social relations.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 176.

² *Ibid.*, p. 78.

³ Quoted in Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, p. 175.

⁴ See Hermann Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*,³ 1909; Heinrich Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister*, 1899; Paul Volz, *Der Geist Gottes im AT und Judentum*, 1910.

⁵ See article, "Spirit (Holy), Spirit of God," by R. Birch Hoyle, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, edited by James Hastings, especially conclusion.

⁶ Karl Barth, *Credo* (New York: Scribner, 1936), p. 136. See also Mackintosh, *op. cit.*, pp. 299-301.

⁷ See a recent book by Edward H. Reisner, *Faith in an Age of Fact* (Farrar & Rinehart, 1937), a desperate and defiant effort to restore liberalism, which seems to have shot its bolt.

⁸ *Hibbert Journal*, July, 1925, p. 625. (*Italic mine.*)

⁹ *The Twilight of Christianity* (New York: Vanguard Press, 1929), p. 294.

¹⁰ E. F. Scott, *The Spirit in the New Testament* (New York: Doran, 1923), p. 32.

¹¹ Emil Brunner, *The Word and the World* (New York: Scribner, 1931), p. 17.

¹² See F. W. Camfield, *Revelation and the Holy Spirit* (New York: Scribner, 1934), pp. 152-154.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 209, 210.

¹⁴ C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching*, p. 96.

¹⁵ Harnack, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*⁴ (Tübingen, 1904), p. 16.

¹⁶ Cf. Athanasius, *First Oration against the Arians*, 14; *Third Oration*, 66.

¹⁷ Tracts on the Holy Spirit by Basil the Great, Archbishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia (370-379); Gregory of Nyssa, Bishop of Nyssa (372); Ambrose of Milan, Archbishop (374-397).

¹⁸ Karl Barth, *Credo*, Ch. XIII: *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum*.

¹⁹ *Heidelberg Catechism*, Question 65.

V

IN QUEST OF A CHRISTIAN METAPHYSIC

ATHANASIUS AND ARIUS

"Through the name of thy holy Servant [marg., child] Jesus."—
ACTS 4:30.

"We must think of Christ as of God."—SECOND LETTER OF
CLEMENT.

Professor Whitehead says:

It [Christianity] has always been a religion seeking a metaphysic, in contrast to Buddhism, which is a metaphysic generating a religion. . . . It is difficult to develop Buddhism, because Buddhism starts with a clear metaphysical notion and with the doctrines which flow from it. Christianity has retained the easy power of development. It starts with a tremendous notion about the world. But this notion is not derived from a metaphysical doctrine, but from our comprehension of the sayings and actions of certain supreme lives. It is the genius of the religion to point at the facts and ask for their systematic interpretation. In the Sermon on the Mount, in the Parables, and in their accounts of Christ, the Gospels exhibit a tremendous fact. The doctrine may, or may not, lie on the surface. But what is primary is the religious fact. The Buddha left a tremendous doctrine. The historical facts about him are subsidiary to the doctrine.¹

One doubts the ability of a metaphysic to generate a religion with any sort of vitalizing and transforming

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 155.

power. At best one expects only an ethics from a metaphysic. At present there is a deeply felt need of a metaphysic, or perhaps better a theology, for the Gospel, for without a theological basis it lacks stability and permanence. True, the facts of Christianity remain unchanged; but the metaphysical background must be re-formulated from age to age. A theology rooted and grounded in the Word of God is indispensable if the Church is to accomplish its purpose in the world.

This note has been sounded in two inaugural addresses during the last academic year: the one by President Hutchins of the University of Chicago, the other by President Mackay of the Princeton Theological Seminary. Both are in quest of a unifying and controlling principle; the one in education, the other in religion. President Mackay wants more than a metaphysic; he is seeking a theology which is more than an analysis of the Christian consciousness and of men's experience of God. It is to be a theology that finds its content in Jesus Christ, God incarnate. He refers to three contemporary efforts for either a metaphysic or a theology: Albert Schweitzer's attempt to revive and readapt the rationalism of the *Aufklärung*; Jacques Maritain's return to Thomas Aquinas; and Karl Barth's *Der Römerbrief*, in which he goes back to the Swiss and German Reformers, to the Bible, and especially to the Epistles of St. Paul.

According to the Gospel of Mark, Christianity began with a man proclaiming a message and winning followers. The man was Jesus of Nazareth from Galilee (Mark 1:9); the message was gospel, good tidings, from God (Mark 1:14); and the followers came to be known as disciples, brethren, and some as apostles. In the course of three centuries Jesus was defined as the

God-man; the Gospel was turned into dogmas and laws; the brotherhood of disciples became an institution of clergy and laity. The transition from protoplasmic and charismatic Christianity to ancient Catholicism, from the religion of the Spirit to a religion of authority, is one of the most fascinating subjects in Church history. We shall limit ourselves to the rise and growth of a Christology, the metaphysic of the Man of Nazareth. It covers the period extending from the first public appearance of Jesus in Galilee to the first ecumenical Council of Nicea, where the issues raised in Alexandria by Bishop Alexander and the Presbyter Arius were considered and a solution, not indeed satisfactory to all the Bishops, was found in the Nicene Creed. In the Council the young deacon Athanasius became a protagonist of the orthodox Christology and led the majority which triumphed over Arius and his associates. On that account one commonly speaks of the controversy as one between Arius and Athanasius.

When Jesus came to Capernaum He confronted the multitudes with more than words and deeds. "What new thing, then," asked Irenæus, "did the Lord bring in His coming? Know that He brought all newness in bringing Himself." He was greater than what He did and what He said. His words had authority and His works were mighty, because He spoke what He was and He did what He said. There was in Jesus something entirely new, different from the priesthood, the Law, the school of philosophy, the mystery cults, the imperial palace. His was an unsurpassed greatness of a superhuman consciousness. He showed men God by what He was more than by what He said. He begot in men a new life defined in terms of faith, hope, and love,

current words but given a new meaning by Christ. He was then, and is now, the supreme personality—a new kind of man and a new form of God's presence among men.

From the beginning to the end of His ministry men asked, "Who is this?" A second question naturally followed: "What must we do?" The answers to the first differed widely. Some said He was Beelzebub (Matt. 10:25); others that He was a prophet or John the Baptist risen from the dead; and still others that He was beside Himself. All agreed that He was not an ordinary man; but He may be a demon, a sub-man, or a superman. Jesus reversed the question when He said to the Twelve at Cæsarea Philippi, "Whom say ye that I am?" Those who had been with Him for weeks and months, heard Him speak and pray, saw Him heal, lived in the light and the power of His person, these were supposed to know Him and no one else, not even His mother or His brothers. So His heart must have beaten a little faster and His eye sparkled a little more brightly when Peter said, "Thou art the Christ" (Mark 8:29). This confession was at the same time a revelation from His Father in heaven (Matt. 16:17). It was the way of knowledge which the Reformers rediscovered, namely, "that truth revealed in Christ admits of no external proof, but is made the inward possession of the believing mind by the convincing power of the Holy Spirit;"² by the *testimonium spiritus sancti internum*—internal testimony of the Holy Spirit.

Jesus rejoiced in this confession because He came into the world, lived and laboured, that men might know the Christ of God; that through one like Him, individuals, nations, all mankind, would be freed from

the bondage of the flesh, of heredity, environment, and the present evil world, and would be enabled to become what God willed them to be, to attain their destiny in time and in eternity. The confession of Peter may be called the *second* beginning of Christianity; for then Jesus of Galilee became a living spirit in the minds and hearts of at least a few men who were still far removed from a complete realization of the meaning of His person and work. The subject of the preaching of the apostles and disciples, the aims of each of the authors of the four Gospels, the content of the first sermon on Pentecost, were clearly stated in the Fourth Gospel: "But these [the things that Jesus did] are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (John 20:31).

In the pre-Pauline period the Jewish Christians answered the question, What must I do to be saved? in their own way. Their view of Christ corresponded to their experience and theory of salvation. Both at Antioch and at Jerusalem they insisted, in the presence of Paul and Barnabas, that Gentile converts had to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses (Acts 15:1, 5). The assumption was that Christianity was only a revised and improved form of Judaism, that Jesus was a new Moses and a prophet of supreme rank. He was anointed of God—that is, spirit-filled—but only a man, and as such He could perform messianic work limited to the Jews and those Gentiles who became proselytes to Christian Judaism.

Jesus, the Christ, need not be more than man, born of Mary, filled with the Spirit in baptism, the herald of the Kingdom, a descendant of David. He was, also, teacher and healer, "a man approved of God with you

by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you" (Acts 2:22); "a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people" (Luke 24:19). His Christhood was attested by the crucifixion, the resurrection, and the exaltation at God's right hand. "This Jesus whom ye crucified, God hath made both Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:36; 4:10). He is now in heaven "until the times of restoration of all things" foretold by the prophets (Acts 3:21). Peter, in the first part of the Acts, speaks of Jesus as "God's servant" [margin, child], "thy holy servant Jesus" (Acts 4:27, 30); "Prince and a Saviour to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins" (Acts 5:31); Jesus of Nazareth Whom God anointed "with the Holy Spirit and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with him" (Acts 10:38); "ordained of God to be the Judge of the living and the dead" (10:42); the prophet Whom, Moses said, "the Lord God shall raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me" (Acts 3:22; 7:37; Deut. 18:15)—a second Moses with an improved Law.

The first Christians evidently did not think of Jesus in terms of metaphysics. They put into words the impression that Jesus made upon those who were with Him all the time that He went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John unto the day in which He was received up. Only persons of this sort were authoritative witnesses of His resurrection and His life (Acts 1:21, 22). This naïve view of Jesus has been called the exaltation Christology, *i.e.*, Jesus became Messiah through baptism, resurrection, and ascension—a "definite explicit act of God."³ Thus He became Son of God by adoption, and not by incarna-

tion through the Virgin. Among the primitive Semites the King is Son of God, by descent or by adoption, when he is enthroned. So in Psalms 2:7: "Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee" (see Acts 13:33).

According to Mark's Gospel, God made the Messiah out of the Man of Nazareth through baptism; according to Paul, God made the Man of Nazareth out of the pre-existent Messiah through incarnation. The one was adopted of God, filled with the Spirit, raised from the dead, and exalted at His right hand. The other was God come from heaven, clothed with the flesh of man, taking the form of a servant, and obedient unto death on the cross. "Wherefore also God highly exalted him" and made Him "Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (Phil. 2:5-12). Both Mark and Paul agree that He ascended into glory and became "Lord," "Christ," "Saviour," "Son of God."

A remnant of Jewish Christians followed neither Peter nor Paul in their conception of Jesus. Eusebius says these Jewish Christians, who later were known as Ebionites, "held poor and mean opinions of Christ . . . They considered Him a plain and common man, who was justified only because of His superior virtue and who was the fruit of the intercourse of a man with Mary. These men thought it was necessary to reject all the epistles of the apostle, whom they called an apostate from the law."⁴ They thought of Jesus as did Nicodemus when he said, "Thou art a teacher come from God; for no one can do these signs that thou doest, except God be with him" (John 3:2). We cannot, however, find a uniform doctrine of Jesus and His person in the early Church. Professor Loofs, in his *Leitfaden der Dogmengeschichte*, enumerates eight

different groups, each of which had its own views of Jesus and His work. Yet in these various theories of the Christ one can find two main tendencies in the apostolic period: the Exaltation Christology (naïve adoptionism) and the Incarnation Christology (naïve modalism). The first Christians did not regard Jesus exalted as merely the Lord of the world; but they called Him, with thanksgiving, "Our Lord."⁵

Paul's view of Jesus was controlled by his vision of Him on the way to Damascus. He saw and heard Him not as a man of Nazareth, nor as Peter caught a glimpse of the Christ in the Nazarene while He was going about and doing good; but he saw the light and heard the voice of Jesus in the celestial Messiah. It meant for him more than a vision and an audition; then God revealed His Son in him (Gal. 1:16); or, in other words, he "was laid hold on by Christ Jesus" (Phil. 3:12); he became in potency "a new creature" (II Cor. 5:17); he died unto the law that he might live unto God (Gal. 2:19); "it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me" (Gal. 2:20). All this happened unto Paul while he was persecuting Jesus and the Church of God, not while he was earning merit by observing the works of the law; therefore the gospel which he expounded to the Galatians was that "a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ," . . . "the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me" (Gal. 2:16, 20).

None of the Twelve, while Jesus was with them in the flesh, could have spoken or written of Him in words like these. Paul's new approach to Jesus through the Messiah in heaven or the Messiah's approach to Paul while he was in hot pursuit of the Christians at Damascus by necessary implication meant not

only a new conception of His love and grace and mission, but a new theory of His being and person; in other words, a new Christology. He found Jesus *with God*, not *among men*; in the *Spirit*, not in the *flesh*. Therefore he believed Him to be God without attempting to define His relation to God in philosophic terms; Paul knew that Jesus was man, but he did not describe how the man in Jesus was related to God in Jesus. That was an issue that came up later, on Greek soil and among Greek Christians.

Professor McGiffert, in his *History of Christian Thought*, is doubtless true to the facts in the sources when he writes:

That he [Paul] believed Jesus to be a divine being there is no possible doubt. Not only the way he speaks of him in his epistles but his theory of salvation itself makes this certain. For Gentiles such a belief was simple enough, but for Paul and other Jews it made difficulties. How was the divine Lord Jesus Christ related to the one supreme God, the Creator and Ruler of the world, in whom all Jews believed? It is significant that though Paul called Christ Lord and assigned him divine functions and recognized him as an object of worship, he did not identify him with God. On the contrary he assumed that Christ and God were two, not one.⁶

Of course, not immediately after he was baptized by Ananias in Damascus could Paul have spoken the sublime words about Jesus that adorn his epistles, composed from about 50 A.D. to 63 A.D. What he received by revelation he achieved by an indefatigable life of faith, hope, and love, through which he paid the debt he felt he owed to both Greeks and Barbarians, to the wise and to the foolish (Rom. 1:14).

The Christology of Paul was not expressed in terms of the Nicene or the Athanasian Creed; but in his epistles one finds the material which the Greek Fathers so formulated as to ward off the heresies of Ebionism and Gnosticism, all attempts to turn Jesus into a prophet and teacher, or into a Lord of a new cult, or into a sage explaining the mystery of the universe and of human life.

Yet there was matter for a Christology, yea, more than a Christology could contain, in the psalm of love in the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians; in the psalm of wisdom, beginning with the words "Howbeit we speak wisdom among the perfect," and ending with the words "For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he should instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ" (I Cor. 2:6, 16); and in the eighth chapter of Romans: "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us." . . . "Nothing shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (8:37, 39). Language failed Paul to convey the content of his faith in Him who saved and sanctified him. He "heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for a man to utter;" we may add, which it is impossible for a man to utter (II Cor. 12:4).

All this could not have been written with the note of assurance and the sense of security but for Paul's theory of Christ's nature and person as given in I Corinthians 15:20-28, only a part of which I shall quote:

Christ the first fruits; they that are Christ's, at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall abolish all rule and all authority and power. . . . And when all things

have been subjected unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subjected to him that did subject all things unto him, that God may be all in all.

Or take the equally great passage Ephesians 1:9-23; and the parallel passage Colossians 1:9-23. All these utterances are based as a building of thirty stories upon the rock foundation of Philippians 2:5-10. What Paul writes was latent in Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi (Mark 8:29). The man who was saved by grace and received into his heart the Spirit of His Son which enabled him to cry "Abba, Father!" saw in Jesus not only his own Saviour and Lord, but the Saviour and Lord of humanity, the fulness of the Godhead bodily, the organ of creation, of providence, of salvation, the head of the Church, the meaning and the consummation of history, the Judge who determines the destiny of the individual and the race. While Paul was not primarily a theologian and did not rely in his preaching of the Gospel upon the wisdom of men but upon the demonstration of the Spirit (I Cor. 2:11), none the less, in a way different from the Greek Fathers, he had a Christological view of the universe and of human life (*Weltanschauung* and *Lebensanschauung*) by inference from his own experience of salvation, by the continual guidance of the Spirit of Truth, and by reflection upon the facts of Jesus Christ crucified, risen, glorified.

To understand the nature of the Arian controversy we shall have to review the conceptions of Jesus from the beginning of Christianity. One finds two deeply rooted convictions about Jesus. First, He was man; second, in one sense or another, He was God. These convictions were the result of fellowship of disciples

with Him. They were witnesses of His words, deeds, death, resurrection, and exaltation. They did not have a Christological or a trinitarian dogma, but their experience of Jesus furnished the material for the Nicene theology and Christology. The Jewish Christians, whether of Palestine or of the Dispersion, were not gifted by nature for metaphysical definitions. The Greeks, who had the philosophic mind and exercised it for centuries, answered the questions, "What think ye of Christ?" "What must I do to be saved?" in a way in which the Jewish Christians could not answer them. Yet the material came to the Greeks through the Jews who preached the Kingdom of God and taught the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 28:31). Through centuries of controversy the trinitarian conception of God and the two-nature theory of Jesus were wrought out, and to this day they are accepted in confessions and catechisms of Christian communions throughout the world.

As we have seen, in the New Testament and in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers the highest terms that were known were applied to Jesus. They were not the language of dogma, but of parable, symbol, and poetry—attempts to express the ineffable in human phrase. Jesus is called "Son of God," "Son of Man," "Saviour," "Lord," "Logos," "the fulness of the Godhead bodily," "the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance," "the Alpha and the Omega." Each of these terms was current in Jewish literature, the literature of the Dispersion included. Jesus, of course, gave new meaning to the old words; He was the new wine in the old wine-skins.

The Gentile Christians did not understand the meaning of the word "Christ;" they had to use other terms

to express the dignity and majesty of Jesus. They kept the phrase "Son of God" and inferred that Jesus belonged to God. In a letter to Trajan, Pliny the Younger, proconsul of Bithynia, informs the Emperor that the Christians sang a "hymn to Christ as a god."⁷ The author of the second letter of Clement says: "We must think of Christ as of God, as of the Judge of the living and the dead." Ignatius (Eph. III) writes that "Jesus Christ is the will of the Father." "The Christians affirm," said Celsus, "that the Son of God is at the same time the embodied word of God."⁸ These are among the earliest non-canonical references to Jesus as God. The words *kurios* and *soter* are often used interchangeably referring to Jesus and to God. Through Justin Martyr⁹ we learn that those who thought of Jesus as "purely man," "a man of men," were offensive to the majority of Christians.

Among the Greek Christians there were those who affirmed that Jesus was identical with God; and thus they minimized His manhood. This was naïve modalism, expressed in the sentence, "He changed himself into a man." Some of the gnostics held this view and were less offensive than the Ebionites; yet they did not satisfy the Church at large. The author of the First Epistle of John doubtless had the gnostics in mind when he wrote: "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God"—an emphasis on the human nature of Jesus against the one-sided emphasis on His divine nature. John's view of Christ is stated in a single sentence in Chapter 5:5: "And who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"—a remarkable blend in one sentence of naïve Christology and soteriology. More than that the Nicene Fathers could

not say, though they said it later in different phrases and in more detailed form.

Ignatius of Antioch on his way to Rome, where he was thrown to the lions for his faith in Christ, wrote a letter to the Trallians in which he says: "Be ye deaf, therefore, when any man speaks to you apart from Jesus Christ, who was of the family of David and of Mary, who was truly born, both ate and drank, was truly persecuted under Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died in the sight of those in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and also was truly raised from the dead, etc."¹⁰ Again, he writes: "There is one physician who is both flesh and spirit, born and yet not born, who is God in man, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, first passible and then impassible, Jesus Christ our Lord."¹¹ Observe that both John and Ignatius are protagonists of a paradox: namely, that Jesus is both man and God in one person.

The human and the divine factors in Jesus Christ were, also, maintained in the first known baptismal symbol, which was taught to catechumens in preparation for baptism and the Lord's Supper. It originated in Rome and, with additions and modifications, it became the Apostles' Creed. Its content, about 150 A.D., was as follows: "I believe in God the Father almighty; and in Christ Jesus His Son only begotten, our Lord, begotten of the Holy Spirit and of Mary the Virgin, crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried, on the third day rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, seated at the right hand of the Father, whence He comes to judge living and dead; and in Holy Spirit, holy Church, forgiveness of sins, resurrection of flesh."¹²

In the forms of worship and in the names applied to Jesus it is evident that He was ranked with God; placed on the side of the divine. But Jesus was not yet identified with God. He is called God (*θεός*), but not the God (*ὁ θεός*).

While the original Christians believed that Jesus was both man and God, they did not attempt a rational statement of their faith; they set forth the facts of faith. Nor did they argue with those who differed from them. They did not argue but confessed. They believed, without knowing how or why, that in Him they had seen the Father and that through Him they had a living hope and received power to live and labour as sons of God. Thus we may say that the early Church had the stuff of a Christology and a theology; but it was theology held in solution, not yet precipitated in systematic doctrine.¹³

To regard Jesus as only a man adopted by God did not satisfy those who were convinced that there was an essential relation between religion in its highest form and the cosmos, humanity, history, and the Old Testament. To Clement, Ignatius, Barnabas, Justin, Christianity was not thinkable without faith in the essential divineness of Jesus Christ.¹⁴

Time came when a rational definition of Christ's person was necessary. When that attempt was made serious dissensions arose in the ancient Catholic Church. Hitherto freedom of thought prevailed; but now, both on account of heresies and schisms and for the preservation of the unity of the Church, the freedom of the Spirit had to yield to authoritative utterances of bishops and theologians.

The problem of the Catholic Church of the second and third centuries was by no means easy to solve. It

amounted to this: the reconciliation of the unity of God with the deity of Jesus. Neither Jews nor Greeks, prophets nor philosophers, would surrender the unity of God. Jews and Greeks were monotheists; and they were determined not to revert to ditheism, tritheism, or polytheism. Yet the Christians were equally certain that Jesus was more than man, that He belonged to the side of God. Hence questions like the following were raised and discussed: How is man in Jesus related to God in Jesus? How is God in Jesus related to the supreme God on high? These are the ultimate problems of Christology, for which different solutions were proposed—problems that are as vital today as they were in the third and fourth centuries.

Dogma that was true to the New Testament and to the faith of the Church had to take cognizance of three things: (1) a man who actually lived, worked, and suffered; (2) a divine Word, Who had always been in the world, but was incarnated in an historic person, Jesus of Nazareth; (3) One Who is both human and divine and is constantly revealing Himself with increasing clearness to His body the Church—a Christ Who was, and is, and is to come, the same yesterday, today, and forever. This is a problem that can be solved only by paradox—the Carpenter of Nazareth is absolute God. Human reason will always balk at this statement as absurd and impossible. Paul's Christ Crucified and John's Eternal Word become flesh were equally a scandal and foolishness. In the one case it was the Cross, and in the other the Person of Jesus. The Prophets, no less than the Nicene Fathers, dealt with paradoxes when they proclaimed the eternal God. He is revealed in One Who hath no form nor comeliness, is despised and rejected of men, from Whom men

hide their face; yet He hath borne our griefs, He was wounded for our transgressions. They made His grave with the wicked. But the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in His hand. He shall see the travail of His soul and be satisfied (Isa. 53).

The Christologies before the Arian controversy were of two kinds. The one, in order to maintain the unity of the Godhead, made Jesus a man spirit-filled. The divine in Jesus was a power, not an essential part of His nature. This view of Christ was called at first adoptionism and later dynamic monarchianism. Jesus was a man with the dynamic of God in Him. Thus the unity of the Godhead was preserved but at the expense of the deity of Jesus. This was the Christology of Theodotus (ca. 190) and Artemon (270), both at Rome.

According to Hippolytus,¹⁵ Theodotus taught that Jesus was a man born of a virgin according to the counsel of the Father, and that, after He lived in a way common to all men, He had become pre-eminently religious. In His baptism in the Jordan Jesus received the Spirit, Who came from above and descended upon Him, and the Nazarene became the Christ. But some are disposed to think that this man never was God, even at the descent of the Spirit; whereas others maintain that He was made God after the resurrection from the dead. Paul of Samosata (Bishop of Antioch ca. 260) revived this theory of Christ and held that Jesus "in his nature was a common man." "He is unwilling to acknowledge that the Son of God came down from Heaven."¹⁶

Another school of Christian thinkers, who maintained the unity of God, were called at first Modalists, and then Modalistic Monarchians. They held that

Jesus was a *modus dei*, a mode of God, clothed with flesh. Thus monotheism was conserved but at the expense of the manhood of Jesus. God revealed Himself as Father, Son, and Spirit—but each revelation was a mode of the one God. In Him there were not three persons, but three ways of manifestation to men. Jesus, therefore, was God in human garb, but not complete man.

Sabellius at Rome (188–212) became the outstanding expounder of Modalism. He assumed that God is one being who manifests Himself in three forms (*μορφαί, πρόσωπα*); one person who assumes different forms to represent the Deity to man. He identified Father and Son, and in this respect was heterodox; but he equalized Father, Son, and Spirit, and to that extent he was orthodox. Sabellianism was condemned at Rome by Bishop Callixtus, who offered a compromise formula in which the idea of the Logos in the Godhead played an important part. Sabellius himself was excommunicated.

With the aid of the Logos a Christology was devised which conserved the unity of God and the deity of Jesus. The Logos in Jesus was the essence of God in man, and Jesus at the same time was truly man. God Himself was one substance (Greek, *οὐσία*; Latin, *substantia*; English, *essence*) with three persons. Thus God is Father, Son, and Spirit not successively as Sabellius maintained, but simultaneously as Athanasius taught;¹⁷ Father, Son, and Spirit are all alike eternal. Thus the trinitarian conception of God and of the divine-human nature of Jesus was established, without doing violence either to His deity or to His humanity.

All these terms and these controversies seem non-

sense to the modern man. Why this waste of words, this talk about something of which no one knows anything? Does not Jesus as presented in the Gospels suffice for anyone who is in quest of salvation? This many men of unusual intelligence have said, not merely the common man, whose intellect does not reach into the higher realms of speculative theology. Even Constantine the Emperor, in a letter to Alexander, speaks of the contention between Arius and his bishop as "about small and very insignificant questions . . . trifling and foolish verbal differences . . . points trivial and altogether unessential."¹⁸

But the Greek Christians of the third and fourth centuries took these issues seriously. Salvation itself depended upon the true conception of Jesus. Unless He was both God and man, He could not be an efficient Saviour. Remember the Greek Christian view of redemption was different from that of the Christians of the apostolic time. Their concept of salvation derived largely from their view of sin.

Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, in his *The Greek View of Life*, throws light on this subject. He contends that the Greeks never, not even in their profoundest philosophies or tragedies, distinguished, as the Christians do, between the conception of sin as a physical contagion to be cured by external rites and the conception of it as an affection of the conscience which only "grace" can expel. The stain of sin "was conceived to be rather physical than moral, analogous to disease both in its character and in the methods of its cure. . . . And as was the evil, so was the remedy. External acts and observations might cleanse and purge away what was regarded as an external affection of the soul."¹⁹

The Greek Christians fitted Jesus and His Gospel into their pre-Christian conception of religion and salvation as naturally as did the Jews into their messianic prophecies. The latter saw in Jesus the Messiah Who came to fulfil prophecy and to establish the messianic kingdom; the former saw in Him the Logos Who delivered men from death by imparting life eternal through doctrine, law, and mystery—the medicine of immortality (Irenæus). Redemption was not satisfaction for the guilt of sin but a remedy for the effects of sin, *i.e.*, man's state of decay and death. As the branch separated from the vine withers and dies, so man separated from God by sin is in the power of death. Salvation, therefore, requires that man be reunited with God; such union was effected through God's coming into flesh, through incarnation. From this point of view Jesus could be an efficient Saviour only on two conditions: (1) The Logos in Him must be the essence (*ousia*) of God. (2) The Logos must be in organic union with the manhood of Jesus. Accordingly, salvation depended on the *homo-ousion* or the *homoio-ousion*. Gibbon makes merry over the controversy about an iota, but for the Greek Christians success or failure depended upon the absence or the presence of the iota. Anselm wrote a tract on *Cur deus homo?* The answer is: "That Christ, God and man, might make satisfaction for the guilt of sin through the sacrifice on Calvary." The answer of the Greek Father lays all emphasis on incarnation, rather than crucifixion; for through incarnation human nature was revitalized by the life-giving essence of God in Christ. The *former* had a juridical, the *latter* a physical or pharmacological conception of redemption.

The Greek Christian way of redemption, therefore, was the result of a blend of early Christian and Greek ideas. Consistently with the view that the result of sin was separation of man from God, the source of light and life, redemption was possible only through the reunion of God and man, the restoration of the original fellowship between the divine and the human. This was effected through the incarnation of the Logos in Jesus.

A Greek Father once said: "The idea of God becoming man is what is new in the new, nay, is the only new thing under the sun." In the *Catechical Lectures* of Cyril we are told: "If the God-man is a phantom, then, also, is salvation a phantom."²⁰ For man can be delivered from sin and death only when he is brought into essential organic union with God; such a union of the divine and the human natures must be found in Jesus if He is to be true Saviour. The substance of the divine life is infused into human nature; man is deified and is endued with life immortal. This is the mystery of redemption realized in Jesus, in Whom the grace and truth of God are made manifest.

In the writings of Paul and John these blessings are personal qualities, and spiritual gifts appropriated by faith. The Gospel, in its appeal to reason and conscience, begets a life of faith, working in love. In the writings of the Fathers grace is turned into hyper-physical substance, conveyed in portions through sacramental channels, and truth is resolved into metaphysical statements, passing all understanding, to be received with implicit faith as a heavenly mystery. Thus, by a process of transformation, salvation by grace through faith came to mean the deification of

man's mortal nature by a pharmacological infusion of the substance of the Logos, incarnate through the mysteries of the Church.

How could the blessing of redemption be appropriated by the individual? The believer had access to God, no longer through Christ in the Spirit, but through the Church, which was in Christ's stead. Grace and truth, once held in solution in the Christian consciousness and communicated by word and life, were precipitated in dogma, law, and mystery in control of the priests. Only through their ministry could men become partakers of salvation; for the priests were the divinely authorized guardians of truth, the administrators of discipline, and the dispensers of grace. The original democratic theocracy of believers was transformed into an aristocracy of bishops; the brotherhood of saints became an institution, with clergy and laity; the religion of the Spirit became a religion of authority.

When Arius proposed a theory of Christ which differed from that held by his Bishop Alexander, he touched the very heart of Christianity: whether Jesus was really a Saviour or merely a teacher and an example who helped men to save themselves. The issue raised was by no mean "unprofitable" or "insignificant," as Constantine supposed, and could not be "buried in profound silence." The historian Socrates says: "From the little spark a large fire was kindled; for the evil which began in the church at Alexandria ran throughout all Egypt, Libya, upper Thebes, and at length diffused itself over the rest of the provinces and cities."²¹ What politics and economics now are throughout the modern world, salvation through Christ was in the ancient world.

Two questions had to be finally decided: (1) How the divine in Jesus is related to the supreme God; (2) How the human in Jesus was related to the divine in Jesus. These issues were as weighty and significant then as the issues of Democracy, Fascism, Nazism, and Communism are now.

What was Arius' view of the nature of Jesus? He affirmed that the Logos incarnate in Jesus was created by God; that there was a time when He was not and when God was not Father. The divine in Jesus is, therefore, not of the same substance with the Father, coexistent and coeternal God. He is of a different substance, the first and highest creature, through Whom God created the world and through Whom man was to be saved. In a letter to Eusebius of Nicomedia Arius says: "We are persecuted because we say that the Son has a beginning, but that God is without beginning . . . because we say that He is of that which is not."²² When the created Logos came into Jesus, He became the soul (*ψυχή*) in Jesus. Thus He was human only in flesh without a soul, for His soul was divinely created by God. Jesus is capable of suffering and of becoming morally perfect, and thus He attains divine honour and becomes a moral hero Whom men are to follow—in every way an unsatisfactory Christology, for it makes Jesus a hybrid, neither man nor God, and therefore not an efficient Saviour from the Greek Christian view-point. Arianism was a last attempt to explain the deity of Jesus without admitting His eternity or losing the unity of the Godhead.

Athanasius became the protagonist of orthodoxy as a young deacon of Alexandria, twenty-eight years of age, and a member of the Council of Nicea (325). Julian the Apostate called him "not even a man but

only a contemptible puppet." ²³ But Gibbon wrote that he was far more able than the sons of Constantine to rule the Empire. The thesis which he set forth in opposition to Arius at Nicea was substantially that in Jesus Christ God Himself entered humanity.²⁴ In the "Second Oration against the Arians" he said: "For we men should not have profited had the Logos not been true flesh any more than if he had not been truly and by nature Son of God." To deliver men from sin, which results in ignorance, decay, and death, the vitality or the life of God must be brought into man. Only so can Jesus save men and give them life eternal. But that the life of God may enter man, Jesus Himself must be complete man—body, soul, and spirit—generic man, who is the head of a new race. To deny that Jesus was both God and man was to leave the Greek Christian without God and without hope in the world.

On this account theologians of different schools for five centuries spent their time and energy that they might have a metaphysical basis for their faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord. More than once when the bishops met in Councils they were enraged to the point of physical violence. Theodoret tells us that when Arius and his associates presented a formulary of their faith to the Nicene Council, it was no sooner read than "it was torn to pieces and was declared to be spurious and false. So great was the uproar against them and so many were the reproaches cast on them for having betrayed religion, that they all, with the exception of Secundas and Theonas, stood up and took the lead in publicly renouncing Arius." ²⁵

The final form of the orthodox Christology and the trinitarian Godhead is found in the Nicene Creed of

325, and in the Constantinopolitan Creed, which is an amended form of the Nicene. It is as follows:

We believe in one God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of His Father, before all worlds [God of God], Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, through whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven and was made flesh of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and entered humanity; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and rose again the third day, according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory to judge the living and the dead, whose kingdom shall have no end: And in the Holy Spirit, the Lord and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father [and the Son], who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake through the Prophets; in the catholic and apostolic Church. We acknowledge one baptism unto remission of sins. We look for the resurrection of the dead; and the life of the world to come.²⁶

Anathemas were pronounced by the Nicene Fathers on those who say: "There was a time when He was not"; or, "Before He was begotten He was not"; or, "He came into existence out of what was not"; or, "He was of a different essence"; or, "He was created, or was capable of change."

Even the revision of the Nicene Creed at the second ecumenical Council, held at Constantinople 381, did not end controversies about the nature of Christ. Indeed, the Arian struggle lasted for fifty-six years. Centuries of controversy about the natures and wills

of Christ followed. The conclusion on this subject is found in a second formula, known as the Creed of Chalcedon, 451, which is not considered ecumenical; but it contains the orthodox Christology—the statement of the ancient Catholic Church in metaphysical terms of what Peter confessed at Cæsarea Philippi, when he said: “Thou art the Christ;” of what Paul saw and heard on the way to Damascus, “I am Jesus whom thou persecutest;” and of what Jesus said to Philip, “He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.”

The theology and the Christology of Nicea and Chalcedon satisfied the Greek view of redemption. In Jesus was the essence of Deity by which decadent, mortal man was revitalized and made immortal. Salvation, to use a Greek term, was *Theo-poiesis*—“making men God.” Jesus became man that men might become divine. Furthermore, the essence of Deity in Jesus could not revitalize man unless Jesus was complete man, human nature generically. Thus the whole of man was brought into organic union with God and man was delivered from the limitations of time and space, from the bondage of decay and death, and shares the life of God the Father through His Son Jesus Christ.

Of course it is easy to smile at the immense importance which the theologians of the fourth century attached to the different views of the Godhead and of the nature of Jesus. There was, however, something at stake that we cannot even now lightly brush aside. Carlyle said that if Arianism had prevailed Christianity in time would have become a legend; either a Jewish sect or a pagan ethics. I heard Professor Harnack say that there were four men who saved Christianity from becoming merely a cosmology and

a moral ideal. They were Paul, Athanasius, Augustine, and Luther. Through their experience of Christ as Saviour and Lord, Christianity was maintained, over against philosophy and law, as the religion of redemption.

In other forms Arianism and Athanasianism have continued through the centuries and are still active in our day. The supreme issue, which each generation must meet in its own way, is in the two original questions: "Whom say ye that I am?" and "What must I do to be saved?" Those were vital questions in the Conferences at Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937. True, one may not be able to find a living Arian or Athanasian. We may criticize the Christologies of both these Nicene Fathers. Both shifted emphasis from the historical Jesus to the pre-existent Logos; both confused revelation and philosophical speculation. Yet Christians, now as always, ask for a metaphysical background of their faith in Jesus as Saviour and Lord. Men want a Christological interpretation of the universe, of history, of the meaning and destiny of life, of the ultimate outcome of the cosmic process. Only then can we say with John: "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?" (I John 5:5). It is not enough that Jesus said what He said and did what He did; but what He said and did will have authority for us when it is the expression of the infinite and eternal God. When we hear Jesus we hear God; when we see Jesus we see the Father. In other words, we need more than the facts of faith; we need the assurance that the facts of faith are the revelation of the Absolute of the Universe. We need a Christian metaphysic, otherwise the occupation of the systematic theologian is gone. The

men in each age who have best understood the Gospel of Jesus have always been the first to interpret it in terms of the thought of their time. They felt that they were not changing or perverting it, but maintaining it as a living power.

We may not accept as infallible and final the Christology and the soteriology of Athanasius any more than that of Arius. We take the liberty of the sons of God to stand in judgment on all theologies; we have the audacity to criticize, to revise, and even to restate them. But, even now, in this scientific age, we are convinced that when we are in contact with Jesus we are in touch with God—not with a creature, not with an idea, not with a teacher or a moral hero sent by God. Indeed, the Arians claimed that Christ did not perfectly know the Father; how then could He reveal Him? If Jesus was only a creature, the worship of Him is idolatry.

Hitherto, neither Judaism nor paganism, law nor philosophy, brought men into fellowship with the Absolute; yet nothing short of that will satisfy the mind and heart of man. Plato affirmed that God was inaccessible to man; the gnostics introduced secondary beings or demiurges, which emanate from God and yet were not like Him; to have unity without trinity would keep man aloof from God; only trinity in unity will enable man to enjoy the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit; will satisfy what men have found through fellowship with Him in Jesus Christ.

Even now, sixteen centuries after Nicea, Christian scholars range themselves on the side of Athanasius rather than on the side of Arius, though in many respects they differ from both.

In his last book, published after his death, Professor Hugh R. Mackintosh, of the University of Edinburgh, says: "The true manhood of Jesus Christ is one aspect of revelation; the other is (for Christ is the *grace of God*) the fulness of His deity."²⁷ He also quotes Karl Barth, who writes:

Jesus Christ is true God. But just as true God He does not keep the majesty of His Godhead to Himself. In that majesty He espouses man in His lowliness, in His suffering and death, in His standing under judgment, in His subjection to death, in His sheer need of grace. This man, this "flesh," it is that the eternal Word of God in the person of Jesus Christ has accepted and raised to unity with Himself. But this very unity means, also, the exaltation of this man, once for all accomplished in Jesus Christ's resurrection and ascension. In Jesus Christ, Who is true God, man is snatched away from the ordinances and necessities of his mere humanity, made partaker of the free, transcendent, eternal life of God Himself. In Jesus Christ the glory of God, without ceasing to be His, has become ours.²⁸

Perhaps the Church universal has not spoken with more authority and unanimity since the ecumenical Councils of the Greek and the Roman Catholic Church than in the utterances of the Second World Conference on Faith and Order, 1937. In the Report of the Second Section, on The Church of Christ and the Word of God, the following statement was unanimously accepted:

We acknowledge that all who accept Jesus Christ as Son of God and their Lord and Saviour, and realize their dependence on God's mercy revealed in Him have in that fact a supernatural bond of oneness which subsists in spite of divergencies in defining the divine mystery of our Lord.

The dogmas of the Trinity, the deity and the humanity of Christ, free will and grace, are paradoxes which reason cannot comprehend. Objectively, they are revealed in the Word of God and, therefore, accepted in faith; subjectively, they awaken silent adoration or the exultant cry, "O the depths of the riches of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, how incomprehensible his ways!"²⁰

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Religion in the Making* (New York: Macmillan, 1926), pp. 50-51.

² Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 7.

³ Weiss, *The History of Primitive Christianity*, I, 119.

⁴ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, Bk. III, Ch. 27 (McGiffert's translation); Harnack, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*,⁴ p. 51.

⁵ Romans 9:5: "Of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh, who is over all, God blessed forever" (Marg., "he who is over all, God, be blessed for ever"); Titus 2:13: "Looking for the blessed hope and appearing of the glory of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ"; II Corinthians 5:19: "That God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

⁶ *Op. cit.*, I, 25-26.

⁷ *Epistulae* X.96; printed in J. C. Ayer, *A Source Book for Ancient Church History* (New York: Scribner, 1913), p. 20 ff. Pliny's letter was written between 111 and 113 A.D.

⁸ Origen, *Against Celsus* II.31.

⁹ *Dialogue with Trypho* 49.

¹⁰ *Epistle to the Trallians* IX; translated by Kirsopp Lake, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Vol. I (Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1912).

¹¹ *Epistle to the Ephesians* VII; *ibid.*

¹² Harnack, *Grundriss der Dogmengeschichte*, p. 38. See also A. C. McGiffert, *The Apostles' Creed* (New York: Scribner, 1902), p. 6 f.

¹³ Sanday, *Christologies Ancient and Modern* (Oxford University Press, 1910), p. 7.

¹⁴ Harnack, *Grundriss*, p. 46.

¹⁵ *Refutation of All Heresies*, VII.35; printed in Ayer, *Source Book*, p. 172.

¹⁶ Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, VII, 27, 29, 30.

¹⁷ Cf. *First Oration against the Arians*, 14; *Third Oration*, 66.

¹⁸ Eusebius, *Life of Constantine*, Bk. II, Ch. 71.

¹⁹ *The Greek View of Life* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Co., 1919), p. 22.

²⁰ Lecture IV, § 9.

²¹ *Ecclesiastical History*, I, 6.

²² Quoted in Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.*, I.4. Printed in Ayer, *Source Book*, p. 302.

²³ W. C. Wright, *The Works of the Emperor Julian* (Loeb Classical Library), III, 151.

²⁴ Athanasius, *The Incarnation of God*, 70.

²⁵ *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I.7.

²⁶ W. A. Curtis, *A History of Creeds and Confessions* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1911), p. 71; see also McGiffert, *A History of Christian Thought*, I, 262-263.

²⁷ *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 278.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 279-280.

²⁹ Theodor Haecker, *Søren Kierkegaard* (Oxford University Press, 1937), p. 35.

VI

THE MIDDLE AGE—WHEN? WHY? WHAT?

"Nobody who is at all acquainted with modern history would question the fact that the Renaissance or the eighteenth century has been influential in shaping our modern civilization. Comparatively few people, on the contrary, are aware of that other fact, that the Middle Ages have been at least as effective in making us what we are, that is to say, in predetermining what are today our usual ways of acting, feeling, or thinking."—ETIENNE GILSON.

In the words of Browning, in "Bishop Blougram's Apology," what is "that Middle Age—these noodles praise?" Gibbon characterizes it as "the triumph of barbarism and religion." Rabelais calls it "a thick Gothic night." The Humanists and the Reformers pass it by on their way to the Classics of Greece and to the Scriptures of the Hebrews and of the Christians. They regarded it as the era of ignorance and superstition—"the Dark Age." The Romanticists in the latter eighteenth and in the nineteenth century revived interest in and appreciation of it. Even Descartes, Copernicus, and Shakespeare, we are told, could not wholly emancipate themselves from it.

The colossal figures that stride across the medieval stage are not puny puppets, creatures of darkness and superstition—there were emperors like Charlemagne and Barbarossa, popes like Hildebrand and Innocent III, schoolmen like Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, mystics like Bernard and Bonaventura, mendicants like St. Francis and St. Dominic, with a back-

ground of crusading armies, towering cathedrals, universities thronged with thirty thousand students, baronial castles, chivalrous knights and ladies fair, wandering troubadours and minnesingers. This was not a dark age, though in it were periods of ignorance, superstition, and vulgarity. It was portentous as the dawn and bright as the morning sun of a new day.

To illustrate the change in the estimate of values of periods in history, I shall quote at some length a paragraph from Gibbon's "Outline of the History of the World," a posthumous publication, referring to the thirteenth century:

The numerous vermin of mendicant friars, Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians, Carmelites, who swarmed in this century with habits and institutions variously ridiculous, disgraced religion, learning and common sense. They seized on scholastic philosophy as a science peculiarly suited to their minds; and excepting only Friar Bacon, they preferred words to things. The subtle, the profound, the irrefragable, the angelic and the seraphic Doctors acquired those pompous titles by filling ponderous volumes with a small number of technical terms and a much smaller number of ideas. Universities arose in every part of Europe and thousands of students employed their lives upon these grave follies. The love songs of the Troubadours and Provençal bards were follies of a more pleasing nature, which amused the leisure of the greatest princes, polished the southern provinces of France and gave birth to the Italian poetry.¹

I can only survey the subject in the large. To this end I shall put and ponder three questions: When, or

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 186.

the time limits of the Middle Age? Why, or the reason for the Middle Age? What, or the controlling ideals of the Middle Age?

The time limits will be determined by the purpose of the historian. If he is writing a history of the Church he may start with Gregory the Great, 590, the last of the bishops and the first of the popes, and end with Luther's Ninety-five Theses on the doors of the castle church at Wittenburg, 1517. The political historian would do well to begin his narrative with the fall of Rome, 476, and end it with the fall of Constantinople, 1453. If one were preparing a history of literature, one could do worse than to introduce it with the translation of a part of the Bible into Gothic by Bishop Ulfilas (381), who invented, also, a Gothic alphabet with the aid of the Greek letters and the runes of the Northmen, and end it with Wyclif's translation of the Bible in the fifteenth century. A history of medieval thought might begin with Augustine's *City of God*, 412, or with the closing of the school of philosophy in Athens, 529, and end with the reign of Lorenzo the Magnificent, 1469-1490, in Florence—Florence and Lorenzo, the one the Athens, the other the Pericles, of Italy. On Italian soil Greece came to life again. Here were the Italian Platonists, Poliziano, Mirandolo, and Marsilio Ficino; the Italian artists, Leonardo da Vinci, Raphael, Michelangelo; the Italian litterateurs, Dante, Petrarch, and Boccaccio; the sculpture of Donatello and the bronze gates of the Baptistery of Florence, which Michelangelo said were "fit to be the gates of Paradise."

These men and events at the beginning and the close of the Middle Age mark the culmination of forces and movements that have been in process of fruition for

centuries. One, therefore, cannot sharply separate the ancient from the medieval or the medieval from the modern age. The transition from the one to the other is gradual, as day shades into night and night dawns into day. Ideas and institutions of the Greco-Roman world live on in the Romano-Teutonic world. The full bloom of the Teutonic civilization had its seed and sprout in Hellenism and Romanism. Elements of modernism came to the surface in the Middle Age—the rights of personality, aspirations to religious and political liberty, attempts at scientific study; remnants of the Middle Age cling to the skirts of the modern age—imperialism, dogmatism, superstition.

For this reason historians have asked whether the division of history into ages and periods is not based on fancy rather than on fact; and, therefore, whether the hard and fast lines between successive periods are warranted. These may be mere devices to aid the memory or convenient schemes for the grouping of data and the presentation of movements in an orderly way; but beyond that of no value. They argue that the respective characteristics of ages do not come and go in chronological order, but run parallel, though in different stages of development.

Let it be granted that the scientific historian can no longer accept Augustine's division of history into six periods and the venerable Bede's into eight, even though these fathers claim the sanction of divine revelation as recorded in the Bible, beginning with the creation and ending with the judgment. It does not follow, however, that ages and periods in history are wholly to be dispensed with on the ground that there is no basis for them in the historical process. It cannot be denied that there is a wide difference between

the ancient and the medieval age in geographical boundaries, in racial factors, in religious, moral, political, and social issues which are both the motive and the goal of endeavour of the men and women of the two ages. "Between A.D. 320 and A.D. 420 the whole outlook of the world changed. There was never such a complete alteration of moral and political values in such a short time, before or since—though the phenomena of the sixteenth and the nineteenth centuries were sufficiently startling."² One also enters into a different atmosphere, has a wider horizon, occupies another point of view, pursues a new method of study, and has a different standard of values, when one passes from the thirteenth to the nineteenth century; the one the high point of the Middle Age, and the other, perchance, the summit of the modern age.

The stretch of time of the Middle Age was about a thousand years—a fact which becomes all the more noteworthy when we compare it with the time limits of the preceding and the succeeding age. The history of the ancient world, written in prose in distinction from the mythography written in epic poetry, dates back to Hecataeus of Miletus (b. ca. 550 B.C.). Of course, historical material, in the form of tablets, carvings, pottery, tombs, annals of state, is found as early as 5000 B.C. In Egypt, not far from Cairo, I was shown a pyramid that is said to have been built at a time as far back of Moses as Moses is back of us. The significant history, however, of the ancient world—from the empires in Mesopotamia to the Roman masters of the Mediterranean lands—covers little more than a thousand years.

The age to which we belong is less than five hundred years old. We are not only modern but youthful.

When Herodotus was in Heliopolis the priests of the temple of the Sun, with a patronizing air, said to him: "You Greeks are mere children." It does not require a vivid imagination to visualize Thomas Aquinas at a reception tendered him by philosophers and scientists of Harvard University and, in the course of the evening, to hear the author of the *Summa Theologiæ*, with a faint suggestion of a sense of superiority, tell his hosts that after all they are only children, and that in due time they may become full-grown men.

The consideration of the "*when*" leads us naturally to a discussion of the "*why*" of the Middle Age. The adjective "middle" implies a period between two ages, an earlier and a later. The term denotes more than a space of time; it signifies a distinctive relation to that which precedes and that which follows. It is the medium through which the essential elements of ancient civilization and culture are borne on, preserved, and transformed in order to become a part of the forms of life, of the civilization and culture, of the modern world. The things which were not shaken and remained after the successive tremors and upheavals of the Greco-Roman Empire became invaluable material for the construction of a new order when the old order had passed away. The Middle Age was both heir and progenitor—the heir of the past and the progenitor of the future. It inherited the religion of Palestine, the art and philosophy of Greece, the law and government of Rome. These became the legacy of a people that was not yet a people but a chaos of tribes that came from the bosom of Asia and, in successive waves, moved across Europe until they reached the shores of the western ocean: the Celts and Teutons—generic terms which in-

clude a vast variety of tribes that in due time became the makers of modern Europe.

On the threshold of the Middle Age we are confronted by the greatest crisis in human history. Humanity seemed to be in its death throes; but time has proved that the agonies of dying were also the pangs of birth. Attinghausen, in Schiller's *Wilhelm Tell*, with his hands upon the head of the boy that bore the apple which was pierced by Tell's never-failing arrow, spoke, with the stammering accents of a dying sage, these words:

*Aus diesem Haupte, wo der Apfel lag,
Wird euch die neue, bess're Freiheit grünen;
Das Alte stürzt, es ändert sich die Zeit,
Und neues Leben blüht aus den Ruinen.*

*From this head where the apple lay,
A new and better time will sprout;
The old crumbles, time changes,
And new life blossoms out of the ruins.*
(Translation mine.)

This is a philosophy of history in poetry; it needs to be taught and sung in these our own critical times. Our age, also, is not a period of decadence; it is rather a time of renaissance—new birth. Let us briefly survey the beginning and end of the Middle Age to make clear its "why."

Rome was not built in a day. Rome did not fall in a day. Modern Europe and America are more than the creation of the Reformation and the Renaissance. They are the last result of all time. Rome stumbled and crumbled in the course of decades and centuries. The historical classic of Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall*

of the *Roman Empire*, is proof of this statement. Rome declined through decay from within and by impact of barbarism from without.

The pristine virtues of the Republic waned and the vices of empire grew. Wealth came with its luxuries and love of ease and pleasure, power with its attendants of pride and haughtiness, of cruelty, leniency of discipline, and loss of reverence for the ancient law and order—these were the hidden and invisible forces that were sapping the vitality of a once unconquerable nation.

As Israel had its Assyrians with whom the Lord scourged His people for their sins, so Rome had its Cimbri, Britons, Gauls, Goths, Vandals, Lombards, Huns, as nemeses for its neglect of the ideals of the founders and fathers. From the second century B.C. to the fifth century A.D., the waves of barbarism beat ominously against the outer bulwarks of Republic and Empire, the banks of the Danube and the Rhine on the north and the shores of the Mediterranean on the south. At the beginning of the period of invasion are the hordes of Cimbri and Teutons, with unknown and untrained leaders; and at the end the Visigoths, headed by Alaric, trained in the science and art of the warfare of his foes; and Clovis at the head of the Franks moulding a kingdom out of tribes that were forced to acknowledge his sceptre.

In the year 400 Alaric invaded Italy, "not with an army but with a nation," writes Gibbon, for the warriors were accompanied by their wives and children to find a home in the rich valleys of Italy. On Good Friday, 402, Stilicho, the commander of the army of the incompetent Emperor Honorius, defeated Alaric in the battle of Pollentia. The festivals at Rome in celebra-

tion of the victory have become memorable because of the heroic self-sacrifice of the monk Telemachus. The lords and ladies of the city were assembled in gala attire to witness the combats of the gladiators in the arena of the Colosseum. At the height of the bloody spectacle, the monk leaped into the arena and rushed between the combatants. The infuriated people, deprived of their gory feast, called for the instant death of the courageous monk, and his life blood trickled into the sands and mingled with the blood of wild beasts and savage men. But his voice was heard crying from the earth; remorse and shame came over emperor and people; and from that day this hideous pastime ceased in Rome forever.

Alaric, however, was only temporarily checked in his advance toward Rome. In 410 he laid siege to the city for the third time. On the 24th of August the soldiers broke through the ramparts of the hitherto uncaptured city and it was given up to violence, savage cruelty, and rapine. This was the beginning of the fall of Rome. To men everywhere it was equivalent to the end of the world.

The Fall was apparently more disastrous than that of Babylon, Jerusalem, or Athens. The city that was the centre of the empire, whose two distinctive attributes were universality and eternity, was now a prey to foreign hordes and the possession of barbarous people. The end of the old world had indeed come; it remained for the Middle Age to bring forth a new world.

Two celebrated men, and at the same time writers of imperishable books, poured forth their sorrow and sang their dirges over the fall of the mistress of the nations of the earth. The one was Jerome, living in the cell of

a monastery in Bethlehem; the other was Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo in North Africa. They heard the sad story of Rome's fall from the lips of terror-stricken fugitives, who poured forth from Italy and found their way to Palestine, to the Ægean Islands, to North Africa—each with a long and harrowing tale of misery and wrong. The aged Marcella, whose adviser Jerome had been and who was the first of the noble and rich ladies of Rome to adopt the ascetic life, was wracked and scourged and trampled to death. Jerome wrote a touching letter about her and about the hapless city. In the preface of his *Commentary on Ezekiel* we find the following:

No doubt all things born are doomed to die; and that which hath grown to maturity must grow old. Every work of man is attacked by decay, and destroyed by age. But who would have believed that Rome, victorious so oft over the universe, would at length crumble to pieces, the mother at once and the grave of her children? She who made slaves of the East has herself become a slave, and nobles once laden with riches come to little Bethlehem to beg. In vain I try to draw myself away from the sight by turning to my books. I am unable to heed them.

A still greater utterance, in the midst of a dissolving and dying world, was the *City of God*, not only Augustine's greatest work but one of the greatest literary productions of all time. He began to write it in 412, two years after Alaric sacked Rome, and he finished it in 427. The African bishop, standing like a second Isaiah, not among the exiled remnants of a Palestinian tribe but among the massive creations of a world tottering to its fall, cried: "Comfort ye my people—O thou that tellest good tidings to Zion, get thee up on a high mountain;

lift up thy voice with strength and say unto the cities of the empire, Behold your God!" For the *City of God* was the first Christian philosophy of history—a voice of hope out of the grave of an age. In the first ten books he submits an irrefutable answer to the charge of the bitter-ender Roman aristocrats that the Christians were guilty of the calamities that had befallen the state; for these, they believed, were inflicted by the ancestral gods to avenge the desertion of their altars. In the last twelve books he presents a masterly contrast between the *Civitas dei* and the *Civitas terrena*, the City of God and the City of the World—the latter built upon the passion for self-aggrandizement, the former upon the love of God as exhibited on Calvary. This contrast and conflict between the two states he traces from Cain and Abel, through the rise and fall of tribes and nations, to the end of the world. Facing courageously the desolation of his time, which quenched every spark of hope in the human breast, he sets his heart upon the omnipotent God of justice and love and shows how Christianity had already wrought marvels of beneficence, and augurs, from what had been done, greater triumphs in ages to come, ending with the glorious vision of the perfect beauty to be revealed when the City of God will shine forth in all its celestial splendour; when sorrow, pain, death, shall have passed away for ever.

In strange and unexpected ways prophecy was fulfilled through history. Clovis, the King of the Franks, in 486 defeated the Roman forces which were sent against him, and before long he extended his dominion over Gaul as far as the Pyrenees. He enlarged his kingdom in the East by the conquest of the Allemanni, a German tribe in the Black Forest; and in the south

and west by the subjugation of the Burgundians, another tribe of German stock. He became a convert to Christianity, a second Constantine, when he was waging a decisive battle with the Allemanni. Before his death in Paris in 511, his four sons divided his possessions among themselves. Their successors came into control of all the lands which are now known as France, Belgium, and Holland, and a large portion of Western Germany. A cosmos of nations was gradually coming out of the chaos of tribes. The foundations of a new world were laid on the banks of the Seine, the Rhine, the Thames. The Latin language of the conquered Romans blended with the dialects of the conquering Teutons. The original Latin ceased to be the colloquial tongue; and in its place, in the childhood of the new nations, were spoken the French, Spanish, Portuguese, and Italian—the Romance languages. The northern Franks, who did not penetrate far into the domains of the old empire, the Germans who remained in Germany and, also, the Teutons who settled in Scandinavia and in England retained and developed their mother tongues. Thus, alongside of the Romance languages, closely allied to the Latin, there came to be the variations of the Germanic language—the Dutch, German, Danish, Swedish, and English.

Turn now, for a moment, to the close of the Middle Age. Constantinople, the new Rome, like the old Rome, fell not in a day; its foundations were sapped, its walls were crumbling, its glory was waning in the course of centuries. The autocracy, splendour, mystery, pride, colourful gaiety shading into vulgar sensuality, of the Byzantine Empire came to an end with the fall of Constantinople in 1453. As in the fall of old

Rome the impact came from the East, so in the fall of the new Rome barbarous, cruel hordes continued to beat against the shores of the Bosphorus, until finally the last vestige of Greco-Romanism was submerged. The Moslem Turk triumphantly placed the crescent where the Cross once stood. The eastern half of the empire passed away, and in its stead came, not a series of Teutonic states, but the empire of Slavic Russia and the kingdoms and principalities of the Balkan Peninsula. Tsar and Patriarch divided the rule over their people for a thousand years. Fugitives of Constantinople found refuge in Italy, brought with them Greek manuscripts, and at the court of the Medici in Florence found patrons of classic literature and art. The incipient renaissance of the West was advanced by the scholarly exiles from the East. What was buried in the ruins of the ancient world rose again at the close of the Middle Age.

That by 1453 an age end had come in the West, as well as in the East, is clear from various tendencies among the Romance and Teutonic nations pointing toward a new era. About this time England gave up its pretensions to the French throne and resumed its insular policy; chivalry was in its decline and the crusading spirit was about dead. None of the western kings or bishops sent aid to Constantinople to defend it against the Turkish invaders as, a few centuries earlier, they had led one crusade after another to deliver the Holy Sepulchre from the power of the infidel. The Roman bishops abandoned their claims to political authority over the whole world and set to work to create a profitable Italian principedom out of a visionary world empire. Nicholas of Cusa was writing books which proved him to be the last of the school-

men and the harbinger of modern thinkers. In the social order the leadership was passing to the burghers, the rising business men, who made tools of kings and princes; the motives of modern commercialism and industrialism—competition and utilitarian egoism—began to come into control. The Holy Roman Empire under Frederick III (1443–1493) was a mere phantom of a once colossal régime, and its claims to represent and to supersede Christendom were entirely relinquished. Frederick was a heretic with a modern outlook and before he died he became the laughing-stock of Europe.

When one surveys the beginning and the continuous process of medieval history, one has reason to conclude that even the destruction of the invading tribes was not a loss without compensation. It prepared the way for a return to the spirit, rather than for a mechanical conservation, of the past. Unless a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die it will not bear fruit. The new denizens and rulers of the one-time Roman territory and of the untamed regions of Western and Northern Europe needed to be trained in new schools of thought and under new forms of government before they could appropriate the classic heritage of Greece and Rome and, in the power of the antique spirit, become creators of a world whose length and breadth, height and depth, could not be contained within narrow medieval boundaries. Conscious of the feebleness of their first efforts at reconstruction, they turned for guidance to the superior wisdom and skill of Greek artists and Roman statesmen. The new states which they founded were smaller and feebler than the Western Empire of which they once were a part; but they furnished new opportunity for the development of in-

dividuality and the making of active citizens who were prepared to share intelligently in the business of the state and to bear faithfully its moral responsibility—the very thing in which Rome, with all its power and grandeur, signally failed. Small as the new states were, often in bitter enmity toward one another, each trying to outdo the other, the ideal of a world-wide empire maintaining universal peace and the security and brotherhood of men never ceased to haunt the imagination of the Middle Age as a lost possibility; it was more than a memory, it was a spark of aspiration that is now burning in a bright flame encircling the earth.

It remains for us to consider the “*what*” of the Middle Age—in other words, its controlling principles of life, thought, action, and institutions for a thousand years.

In the beginning of this period the formative factor was the striving for *catholicity* and its corollary, *uniformity*. By catholicity I do not mean merely one of its manifestations in the medieval Catholic Church. In the larger sense, catholicity means universality, the integration of the particular, the individual, the local, of all men, all ideas, all things, into a uniform system. Its goal is to establish order in confusion, unity in divisions, to reconcile contradictions, and to harmonize discords. Its scope is world-wide and time-long, including in its scheme of order all nations and tribes, all time and space. What the spirit of God accomplished while brooding over the primitive abysmal waste and void, namely, the transformation of chaos into cosmos—a delicately balanced and highly integrated universe—that the spirit of man achieved in the processes of history from primitive savagery to the refined

civilization and culture of the Periclean and the Augustan Age.

The principle of catholicity was the gift of the ancient world to the Teutonic tribes. It required long and severe discipline, devastating wars, patient endurance of hardships, and wise statesmanship to reintegrate into a harmonious structure the fragments of the antique civilization and the fresh, untutored but rich and promising spirit and life of the tribes budding into nations in Western Europe.

The *Imperium Romanum* was a consummate creation of the principle of catholicity; it came from various sources and in different forms into the formative periods of the city states, and of the outlying provinces of Greece and Rome, of Africa and Gaul, of the decadent empires and kingdoms of the East.

There was the catholicity of the Great Unknown Prophet of the Exile, of Jesus the Nazarene, of Socrates and Plato, of Cæsar Augustus and Constantine the Great; or, to put it in other phrase, the catholicity of religion, of philosophy and art, of law and government, Palestinian, Hellenic, Roman. Out of local tribal myths and cults came the universal religion; out of personal fancies and opinions came universal ideas of philosophy; and out of many tribes and tongues and kindreds came an empire whose marks were universality and eternity.

One can readily trace in single sentences, or in volumes of classic prose and poetry, the expansion of the scope of vision and interest and the sense of responsibility and privilege, from the narrow confines of the village to the cosmopolitan mind which saw all of humanity—saw it steadily and saw it whole.

One of the thrilling verses of the New Testament is

found in the second chapter of Luke's Gospel: "Now in those days there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled." Pause for a moment and reflect upon the implications of that decree. One man commands the whole world. Is it any wonder that emperors were exalted to the rank of gods? It is a far cry, indeed, from naked savages roaming wild over the steppes and through the forests of Asia and Europe, each fighting and devouring the other, to the stately palaces and temples of the Augustan Age. Then the gates of the Temple of Janus were closed and, for a season at least, the sword was sheathed and the spear was suspended to decorate the hearth. Lo, the age of imperial catholicity is at hand!

Another sentence gripping the mind and heart of the reader is the last mandate of the Galilean to His disciples: "Go ye; and make disciples of all nations." Here looms the vision of a new humanity, in a new heaven and a new earth—a sort of fellowship, not of flesh and blood, of birth and breed, but of spirit and life; a community of men and women, wide as the earth, longer than time, in which there can be neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, no male and female, for all are one man in Christ. The catholicity of the spirit of Jesus was the indispensable requisite for the catholicism of doctrine, worship, and government of the Church of the Ancient and the Middle Age. Lo, the age of religious catholicity is at hand!

Time came when the mind of man grappled with and mastered the world above him, about him, and within him. In a fragment of Euripides we are told that the Greeks were bent upon "discerning the deathless and ageless order of nature; whence it arose, the how and

the why." The Roman poet sang in the theatre, "Nothing human is foreign to me." The Stoic philosopher cried, "The whole world is my Fatherland." For the enlightened Greek there was

*A bright intelligence which darts
Its influence through the several parts
And animates the whole.*

The idea of universality is wrought out in Plato's *Republic*, in form exceeding the simple beauty of a Greek temple or the mystic grandeur of a Gothic cathedral. Mind has mastered matter; order has come out of confusion; law has subdued caprice; the particular and local are brought into subjection to the universal. Lo, the age of philosophic and æsthetic catholicity is at hand!

Vergil was led captive by its ideal; and he turns his captor into a servant in the *Æneid*. The genius of Rome pulsates in its national epic. The idea of universal empire dominates the whole poem—Rome falls, but the spirit of Rome marches on and becomes master in a new age, in new forms of life, and among people of another stock and of a different spirit.

The first half of the Middle Age marks the period in which the *Völker-chaos*, as Houston Chamberlain calls it, of the north and west of Europe was gradually brought into subjection to the spirit of religious, philosophical, and imperial catholicity. The Gothic conquerors were overcome by their Roman subjects, who ruled them not by carnal weapons but by the power of the mind. The long and dreary centuries from the fifth to the tenth become meaningful and purposive when we discern invisible yet irresistible ideas moulding crude human material into intellectual, artistic,

ethical, and religious form—forms of doctrine, of worship, of thought, of government, of moral living, and of plastic arts and literature.

A new empire rose out of the wreck of the old—the Holy Roman Empire; a new conception of authority prevailed, not merely the right of might, *jure humano*, but the might of right, *jure divino*.

Pope and emperor divide the world between them—one to rule the spiritual and the other the temporal affairs of men. This dominion is personified in the heroes of Church and State of the succeeding centuries—Gregory the Great, Nicholas I, Hildebrand, Innocent III, in the Church; Clovis, Charlemagne, the Ottos, Henry IV, and the Hohenstaufen Barbarossa, in the State. These supermen enter into gigantic battles with one another for absolute power. Gregorovius says: "This titanic war of the Middle Ages filled and connected the centuries and formed the greatest spectacle of all ages."

Catholicity worked itself out also in feudalism, which was built upon loyalty of king to emperor, of duke and prince to king, of baron to duke, of count to baron, of nobleman to count, of the masses to the nobility. In the Church a parallel gradation of loyalties is found in the hierarchy and the laity—pope, cardinal, archbishop, priest, people. The whole structure had the sanction of God; and it was an endeavour to establish the reign of justice and peace, the City of God upon earth.

Catholicity was the key-note and the *motif* also of the theology and philosophy of the schoolmen. As emperor and pope professed to control the civil and the religious affairs of men, so the schoolmen set themselves the task of unifying all knowledge—the revelation

of God and the discoveries of science and philosophy. Faith and reason were assumed to be commensurate; and the fund of truth in the faith of the Church was to be demonstrated by the reason of the schools. Scotus Erigena was a pioneer when in the ninth century he put into clear terms his theory of the harmony of faith and reason. The ripe fruit of scholasticism was the *Summa Theologiæ* of Thomas Aquinas—an intellectual catholicity that was to control the mind of man for ever. The world of St. Thomas was “dominated by a few great simple universal ideas, of which the life of man, both individual and associated, was the reflex. At the heart of things was God, revealed in the uniformity and harmony of nature. The centre and crown of creation was man, to whom was given the rule over the earth, which again was the centre of the material universe, served by the obedient sun and accompanied by the planetary and starry host in tributary homage.”³ At the Council of Trent, 1543-63, a copy of the *Summa Theologiæ* was placed on the desk of the secretary beside the Holy Scripture and the Pontifical decrees; the implication was that these books and documents contained the solution of all questions relating to time or eternity. Professor Kirsopp Lake says: “The final achievement of Christian theology was the synthesis effected by St. Thomas Aquinas between the Christian theology and the philosophy of Aristotle. . . . Never again has there been a time when the unification of aspiration and knowledge has been so completely realized by organized Christianity.”⁴

Catholicity and uniformity also produced the ideal of life represented by the medieval monk. In the ancient age the monk lived, wholly and solely, the con-

templative life. His aim was to be alone with God, and, therefore, he stood aloof from his fellow men. A new note was sounded by the founders of the mendicant orders—Dominic and Francis. The monk was no longer to retire from the world but was to remain in it and to take part in conquering it for the Church. Indeed, if the Church is to rule the world, the individual must renounce the world, must submerge himself that the institution may be advanced. The mark of the religious man was self-repression instead of self-affirmation. The saint could not own his title unless he was prepared to make absolute surrender of body, intellect, will, and possessions.

The companions of St. Francis put this question to him: "Tell us, father, what is the perfect and the highest obedience?" He replied:

Take a lifeless body and set it where you please. You will see that it resenteth not being moved, nor changeth its position, nor crieth out when it is let go. If that it be set upon a throne, it looketh not toward the highest, but the lowest. If it be clad in purple, then it is doubly wan. This is the truly obedient person that asketh no questions wherefore he should be changed elsewhither. Promoted to office, he holdeth his wonted humility; and the more he is honoured, the more he thinketh him unworthy.

The creations of catholicity—a universal church, a universal state, a universal philosophy, a universal rule of life—find man's intellectual centre of gravity not in himself, in his convictions and conscience, but in the authoritative institutions which embrace and control his life; the political and religious order to which he belongs is less a product of his activity than something which is imposed ready-made upon him. Uncondi-

tional submission and unquestioning devotion are required of him. Though there is warmth of feeling and serious diligence in works of mercy, the spirit of free, joyous, and independent action is wanting. It is a life of impotence and of conscious impotence as far as the individual is concerned.

The dream of a *Respublica Christiana*, of the Holy Roman Empire, the commonwealth of nations, for a time seemed to be on the verge of realization. The reign of God was at hand when His vicars disposed of the affairs of men. However magnificent this scheme of empire is, kindling the imagination and inspiring awe and reverence, it has not so far been able to maintain itself permanently. It apparently has in it the germs of its own decay. It fails because it disregards the inborn demands of individualism, both of the nation and of the person. Cosmopolitan uniformity does not leave room for the free development of an infinite variety of mental, moral, religious, political, and æsthetic life. The particular and the individualistic, with its priceless value, fascinating beauty, and absorbing interest, is suppressed in the maintenance of vague, colourless, and dull uniformity. Such an order of life is in direct contradiction to the deepest impulses and aspirations of men, to the ideal of self-expression and self-realization in national, communal, and personal life. For this right and privilege men have given their lives. When an ideal is simply projected into thin air without basis in the nature of man, it never becomes real and practicable, though for a time it may seem to prevail. Attempts to maintain it by suasion or by force will end in obscurity, distortion, and compromise. This is precisely what made the catholicity, realized in the thought, the institutions, and the living

of the Middle Age, untenable. What was in theory a divine order of life became in practice all too human, even a régime of inhumanity and brutality. This applies with equal force to all modern schemes of universalism—the humanitarianism of Comte, the socialism of Karl Marx, the communism of the Third International, and the self-negating pessimism of Schopenhauer.

The Holy Roman Empire was more than a form of government. It was a view of human life as a whole. Its key-note was uniformity. Every phase of man's life—politics, art, religion, morals, philosophy, the individual and the group—was to be regulated by God through His anointed servants, the pope and the emperor.

The distinctive features of the Holy Roman Empire become clear when we contrast them with the ideals of modern democracy. For the person it meant paternalism versus individualism; for the State, cosmopolitanism versus nationalism; for the Church, catholicism versus denominationalism; for the school, traditional authority versus free investigation; for morality, self-repression versus self-expression; for piety, abject humility and acquiescence in the social order versus personal independence and social control; for art, romanticism versus realism. The word summarizing the spirit of the Middle Age is "monarchy"; of the modern age it is "democracy."

The latter part of the Middle Age is dominated more and more by the spirit of individualism and its corollary, diversity. Even from the beginning there were two conflicting tendencies struggling for the mastery—one was the catholicity, supernaturalism, and other-worldliness of the decadent Greco-Roman world; the

other was the individualism, the naturalism, and the buoyant, life-affirming optimism of the youthful nations of western Europe. We may not be far wrong when we characterize the former as theism modified by humanism and the latter as humanism modified by theism. The one stands for authority and obedience, the exaltation of the institution and the repression of the individual; the other, for the autonomy and free expression of the individual reason and conscience.

From the eleventh century on catholicity and uniformity are on the defensive. Individualism and diversity take courage, more and more, to assert themselves in heresy, sect, and schism; in political sedition and rebellion; in nationalism and naturalism; in the rise of the burgher in the face of the priest and the prince. The Teutonic man is becoming of age and is beginning to feel his ability to think and to act for himself. With that consciousness emerging in the bosom of men comes the dawn of a new age.

The differences in the spirit of these tendencies become audible in the hymns and songs people sang. In 1150 Bernard of Morlaix composed the hymn of judgment, which is in accord with the gloomy mood of the period:

*The world is very evil,
The times are waxing late;
Be sober and keep vigil,
The Judge is at the gate.*

Thomas of Celano, in 1230, wrote the *Dies Iræ*:

*Day of Wrath! O day of mourning! See fulfilled
the prophets' warning,
Heaven and earth in ashes burning!*

Men of another mood sang other songs—the troubadours, the wandering minstrels, the vagrant students, the blithe and gay youth. I select illustrative stanzas at random from John Addington Symonds' "Wine, Women, and Song":

*Cast aside dull books and thought;
Sweet is folly, sweet is play:
Take the pleasure Spring hath brought
In youth's opening holiday!
Right it is old age should ponder
On grave matters fraught with care;
Tender youth is free to wander,
Free to frolic light as air.*

Again:

*List, my girl, with words I woo;
Lay not wanton hands on you:
Sit before you, in your face
Gazing, ah! and seeking grace:
Fix mine eyes, nor let them rove
From the mark where shafts of love
Their flight wing.
Try, my girl, O try what bliss
Young men render when they kiss!*

Here is a wine song:

*Sweet in goodly fellowship
Tastes red wine and rare O!
But to kiss a girl's ripe lip
Is a gift more fair O!
Yet a gift more sweet, more fine,
Is the lyre of Maro!
While these three good gifts were mine,
I'd not change with Pharaoh.*

To this period, also, belongs the oft-sung *Gaudeamus Igitur*:

*Let us live, then, and be glad
While young life's before us!
After youthful pastime had,
After old age hard and sad,
Earth will slumber o'er us.*

The transition from the Middle Age to the Modern Age was made through two historic movements: The Renaissance, the rediscovery of man, and the Reformation, the rediscovery of God. From the one came humanism and from the other evangelicalism, the direct opposites of the two controlling ideals of medieval life, universal dominion by the group and the renunciation of the world by the individual.

Renaissance and Reformation were all the more irresistible on account of the long-felt inadequacy of the Catholic conception of life to satisfy the human heart. It proved, after centuries of experiment, a "bed shorter than that a man can stretch himself on it; and covering narrower than that he can wrap himself in it" (Isa. 28:20). It satisfied neither the progressive men of the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries nor the requirements of the New Testament. Its defect was the fatal disease of one-sidedness—the one-sided emphasis of the divine to the neglect of the human, of the institution to the neglect of the individual, of authority to the neglect of freedom. Men were the wards of the Church and the subjects of the State. Thought and action were prescribed for them. But when the individual awoke to his personal rights and affirmed his ability to know and to do, he could no longer be curbed by prince or prelate.

The positive forces favouring a new era were the Teutonic tribes gradually becoming mature nations, each striving for a political and religious order which was not simply its heritage but its creation. Greco-Roman culture, preserved in the Catholic Church, stood for authority and obedience, the exaltation of the institution and the repression of the individual; the Teutonic spirit aspired to freedom and self-realization, the rights of reason and conscience. Teutonism and Catholicism cannot permanently dwell under the same roof.

The new nations were stimulated to revolt by the revival of the ancient classics. The writings of Greece and Rome expressed in crystal phrase the spirit that throbbed in Celt and Saxon. What the Greeks once did, the Teutons now desired to do.

The rediscovery of the New Testament and the re-experience of saving faith, sovereign grace, and the priesthood and brotherhood of believers, had in them the dynamic of a new age—an age in which nationalism took the place of cosmopolitanism and denominationalism of Catholicism, the one largely controlled by humanism, the other, relatively at least, by evangelicalism. Both were the result of individualism and personal freedom put in place of institutionalism and imperial authority. Individualism in its reaction against vested authority was held in check in the formation of new states by racial affinities and national traditions. But in the Church it ran riot; not content with the State Church, men organized dissenting groups within the State and regardless of the State.

All things were made new. Observe the rise of new nations, languages, literatures, arts, philosophy, theology. It is the age of invention and discoveries—the

mariner's compass, printing, gunpowder, manufacture of paper, the discovery of new lands, America, a sea route to India, circumnavigation of the globe, the Copernican astronomy, the humanistic view of life; new theories of Church and State are propounded. Evidently the Renaissance was more than a revival of the antique. That is only one of the inspiring elements in the new movement. It was not an abrupt break with the Middle Ages but an organic outgrowth of its hidden life. The elements of Classicism and Medievalism were appropriated by the Teutonic man, who created a new world and lived a new life in his world.

Nationalism takes the place of imperialism. Independent and rival nations are born, whose only aim is self-assertion and enlargement of dominion—Italian, French, German, English. Machiavelli made that which is useful or harmful to the State the only law in politics. Might makes right. Each nation is armed for offence and defence. Diplomacy and intrigue were the business and sport of kings and princes. The lines were laid for the cataclysm of the World War which followed centuries later.

In the train of nationalism came the native tongues to supersede the Latin used in the courts and churches and schools of Europe, and national literatures were composed in the vernacular: Dante in Italy; Rabelais in France; Shakespeare in England. National churches were jealous of foreign interference. Each nation resolved to control its own church. The arts and sciences—jurisprudence, medicine, natural science, and even morality—were freed from ecclesiastical dominion.

A new sea route to India was discovered and the New World turned the attention of men from crusad-

ing in Palestine to colonizing America. Men went in search of gold instead of the Holy Grail and the Holy Sepulchre. The rise of capitalism put to flight the ideal of ascetic poverty. With the new nationalism came a new denominationalism; the churches assumed the same attitude toward one another as the rival states; the one proselyted, the other conquered, each to enlarge its domain.

I have tried to set forth clearly the organic relations of the Middle Age to the ancient world on the one hand and to the modern world on the other. I have defined, also, what appear to me to be its dominant principles and ideals—in the beginning catholicity and uniformity; in the end, individualism and diversity. In the discussion of this subject one necessarily must consider the two great crises in the history of the Western world—the transition from the Greco-Roman to the Middle Age, and the passing from the Middle to the Modern Age. Times of crises like these are troublesome, discouraging, insecure, uncertain. Men's hearts fail them for fear of the things that will come to pass. It appears that man, with all his abilities, is in the end doomed to failure. The splendid creations of human genius crumble to dust. Yet when we follow history through, we cannot help but take courage. After each fall there has been a rising again; what appears to have been the death struggle has been in reality the travail of birth. Old things have passed away; all things have become new.

The nations of the world today, not of one continent or another but of all continents, are in a crisis perhaps more decisive than that which was precipitated by the fall of Rome or by the Renaissance and the Reformation. We have passed through the age of catholicity

and conformity and the age of individualism and division. What next? How shall we meet the present issues which concern the life of every man, woman, and child? Shall we return to imperialism, that is, to the Middle Age? Shall we accept the programme of the Third International or of Fascism? Shall we attempt to patch up, as best we can, the existing order, and let things remain as they are? Shall we go forward, intelligently and freely accepting the best of the past, incorporating the best of the present, blending catholicity and individualism, authority and freedom, and advance into an order better than any we have yet attained? It is clear that upon the answer the nations give to these questions will depend not only the fate of each, but the fate of humanity as a whole.

FOOTNOTES

¹ *Miscellaneous Works*, II, 422 (1st ed.).

² Sir Charles Oman, *The Sixteenth Century* (New York: Dutton, 1937), p. 7.

³ Ephraim Emerton, *The Defensor Pacis of Marsiglio of Padua* (Harvard University Press, 1920), p. 2.

⁴ *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1922), p. 8.

VII

SCHLEIERMACHER AND BARTH¹ CONTINUITY OR DISCONTINUITY

*"The prevailing concept of nineteenth-century thought was the principle of continuity. This principle has now become so much a part of us that we cannot 'look at a gap or chasm without shuddering.' . . . The gap between the inorganic world and the organic world; the gap between the organic world and the world of ethical values."—T. E. HULME (in Horton's *Contemporary English Theology*, p. 44).*

Troeltsch is reported to have said, during the centenary celebration of the publication of Schleiermacher's chief works, that "Schleiermacher's programme remains the great programme of all scientific theology and only needs working out, not the substitution of new methods."² My purpose is to discuss not the theology or the sociology of Troeltsch, as the subject of this paper may imply, nor the theology of Schleiermacher, but Troeltsch's pronouncement on Schleiermacher's programme and method of all scientific theology.

This raises the fundamental question which always confronts the theologians: continuity or discontinuity; evolution or creation; immanence or transcendence; monism or dualism; reason or revelation; the world and word of man or the world and word of God; in a general way, Hellenism or Hebraism; orientalism or occidentalism?

¹ All the footnotes for this chapter will be found in proper sequence on page 221.

These antitheses are evident in Christianity from the beginning: Jewish Christians and Paul; the Fathers and Marcion; Clement and Origen, on the one hand, and Methodius on the other; Pelagius, Augustine and Aquinas, on the one hand, and Scotus and Ockham on the other; Erasmus and Luther; Servetus and Calvin; Hegel and Kierkegaard; Schleiermacher and Barth. The one group are both-and men; the other either-or men.

The latter class is more or less disposed to stand aloof from the world—its wisdom, its art, its politics, its morals, its pleasures. Clement of Alexandria alludes to certain Christians who fear philosophy as children fear a wolf—a fear that is even now in many Christian hearts. They may become schismatics and sectarians. The former class comes to terms with the world and lives peaceably in it by conforming more or less to it. They prepared the way for the ancient Catholic Church, which is the most imposing compromise in the history of religion.

It cannot be said, however, that either of the two groups was opposed to Christianity. On the contrary, each tried to be true to Christ and to its faith in Him; each had for its aim the maintenance of the prestige of Christianity in the face of an indifferent and hostile world. Theodore Haecker does justice to both when he writes:

The different historical conditions make it clear why, from the beginning of Christianity, there have always been men whose mission it was to separate the divine from the human, the heavenly from the earthly, and faith from philosophy, with all the sharpness of paradox and passion; and then again others whose mission it was, after the air had been cleared by storms and by these separations, to restore

harmony and peace once more. But both types are servants of the same truth, of the same power, and of the same God.³

The controversy between these two types of Christians and theologians is acute at present. I shall, therefore, discuss from an historical point of view Erasmus and Luther, Hegel and Kierkegaard, Schleiermacher and Barth.

Erasmus wrote a diatribe entitled *De libero arbitrio* (1524). Luther replied in a tract entitled *De servo arbitrio* (1525). In these works the difference between evangelicalism on the one hand and Roman Catholicism and the humanism of the Renaissance on the other is sharply drawn. They contain two conceptions of religion and of Christianity that run parallel through the history of the Church from Paul to Barth.

Both Erasmus and Luther saw clearly, as so many of their contemporaries could not see, that the cardinal issue in the Reformation was the conception of the will of man, whether it is free or bound; whether, therefore, salvation is by grace alone, or partly by divine grace and partly by human merit, or wholly by human effort. In the last section of the *De servo arbitrio*, Luther says to Erasmus: "In this I give you great praise, and proclaim it—you alone, in pre-eminent distinction from all others, have entered upon the thing itself, that is, the grand turning-point of the cause. . . . And therefore you attacked the vital part at once; for which, from my heart, I thank you."⁴

The irreconcilable contradiction between Luther and Erasmus, which never permits a compromise, appears at three points: their way of understanding the New

Testament, their view of Jesus, and their conception of salvation.

Erasmus was a historical and critical scholar. He went *ad fontes*, back of the schoolmen, of the Councils, of the Fathers, even of Paul, to Jesus. He was a cultured gentleman, refined to his finger-tips, enjoying sumptuous living, and fearing tumult. He was in search of a religion or a philosophy of life better than that which was offered him by the church of Rome. Luther was not primarily a scholar, a critic, a historian; he was a sinner in search of salvation. He, also, went back to the New Testament, but with a spirit other than that of Erasmus. Each found what he was seeking. Erasmus found a teacher, an example, the Nazarene Who preached the paternalistic theism of the Sermon on the Mount. Luther found the Christ, the Saviour and Lord, Who brought life and salvation through grace and faith as taught in the Epistle to the Romans. Erasmus restored the religion *of* Jesus; Luther restored the religion *about* Jesus. The one became the head of a new school in which men were taught how to save themselves by doctrine and deed; the other became the head of a fellowship of men saved by grace through faith. Luther considered Christianity as the only way of salvation and would not compromise with the religions of the world; Erasmus regarded Christianity as one among many religions, claiming however that it taught the true philosophy of life and therefore was the highest form of religion.

Luther describes the difference in the theory of knowledge as held by Erasmus and himself in these words:

I thank my God and glory as did Paul (II Cor. 11) that

I have knowledge which I do not so far find in Erasmus, though God, in other respects, has given you learning, art, understanding, experience, practice, and every preparation for fine speaking and human wisdom. While I am inexperienced in ornamental speech, I by the grace of God am not inexperienced in that wisdom that Christ has given me to understand. . . . For the Scriptures, even the least portion of the Scriptures, no one upon earth, without the Holy Spirit, can know or comprehend.⁵

A statement like this Erasmus either would not accept or could not understand, in spite of his mastery of the classics and the knowledge of his time. It must have appeared as foolish to him as it did to the Greeks or as it does to the humanists today. He wrote a letter to Zwingli in which he says naïvely: "It seems to me that I have taught nearly all the things which Luther teaches, only not so atrociously (*atrociter*), and I have abstained also from certain enigmas and paradoxes."⁶ In the same vein, after he had read Zwingli's "True and False Religion," he wrote: "Oh, good Zwingli, what have you written which I did not write myself long ago!" It is the *ænigmata* and the *paradoxa*, which the scholar could not comprehend and which mere words cannot explain, that separated Erasmus, the erudite humanist, from Luther, the evangelical Reformer.

The second point of difference is a corollary of the first: their conception of Jesus. In a letter to Nicolas von Amsdorf concerning Erasmus of Rotterdam, written apparently after the Diet of Augsburg, Luther puts his finger upon the line of demarcation between him and Erasmus.

Erasmus asks the question: "Why Christ, so great a teacher, descended from heaven, when there are

many things taught even among heathen which are precisely the same, if not more perfect?" Erasmus answers his own question by saying: "Christ came from heaven, that He might exemplify those things more perfectly and more fully than any of the saints before Him!" Luther indignantly replies:

Thus, this miserable renewer of all things, Christ (for so he reproaches the Lord of glory), has lost the glory of a Redeemer, and becomes only one more holy than others. . . . This was the sentiment that first alienated my mind from Erasmus. From that moment, I began to suspect him of being a plain Democritus or Epicurus, and a crafty derider of Christ.⁷

Luther's estimate of Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio* is upheld by Professor von Harnack, who, no longer biased by the heat of controversy, speaks of the diatribe as "*die Krone seiner Schriften, allein eine ganz weltliche, im Tiefsten irreligiöse Schrift*,"—"the crown of his writings; and a wholly irreligious tract."

The epistemology and the Christology of each are the regulative principles of his soteriology; or, conversely, one may say that the way of salvation of each determines both his theology and his Christology.

According to Luther, man can do nothing, corrupt as he is through sin, for his own salvation. It is a work of God; of grace alone and faith alone and the Word alone. To allow man a part in salvation is to yield to Pelagianism in one form or another. One can find the assurance of salvation only in God; if man's will is involved, assurance is lost.

Erasmus held, in common with the humanists of all the Christian centuries, that "Christianity was primarily an ethical system; Christ was the great teacher and

exemplar"; man has a sufficient remnant of freedom of the will to reject the grace of God offered through Christ; "to be a Christian meant to conduct one's life in accordance with the principles which governed Him. Jesus appeared in the rôle of a sage, and Christianity under the aspect of a moral philosophy rather than a religion of redemption. . . . The one all-important thing . . . is love for one's fellows, manifesting itself in charity, sympathy, and forgiveness." ⁸

When one understands the fundamental difference between Luther and Erasmus, the difference between Hegel and Kierkegaard, and Schleiermacher and Barth becomes clear and can be seen in its historical perspective.

Troeltsch counted himself a lineal descendant of Erasmus. For he says: "The Father and Path-breaker of historico-critical thinking and the sentimentalism that seeks God *within*, rather than *above*, man is Semler (1725-1791). Yet all that the new theology has even now achieved is to be found in the great and marvellous Erasmus." It is a strange but significant coincidence that in the eighteenth century Semler said of Erasmus almost the same thing that Troeltsch said of Schleiermacher: "The great Erasmus is the man who deserves immortality because he rendered greater service to theology than all the others. In all the articles of theology he already accomplished the good which is afterwards found in others." ⁹ This opinion is corroborated by Loofs' résumé of Troeltsch's statement concerning Luther, who, Troeltsch says, "stopped in the Middle Ages because he did not go back to Jesus but to Paul, who changed the teaching of Jesus to a gospel of a supernatural salvation; and the root of the Middle Ages was in this gospel." ¹⁰ Here is the

contrast, Paul and the Middle Ages on the one hand and the historical Jesus and the modern age on the other. Luther still is a child of the Middle Ages, not a modern man; Erasmus is the modernist and the original father of the liberal theology.

Loofs makes this clear in a later paragraph of the tract from which the preceding statement was taken. Erasmus, he says, "appears as the ideal type of this humanistic theology. With him, Christ was the incarnation of religion that is the same everywhere. It is he who began the retreat from Paulinism toward the Sermon on the Mount, toward the simple religion of the faith of Jesus. In the presence of Luther he was not only the moralist before the religious genius, but, also, the representative of the modern conception of the anti-supernatural and universal religion."¹¹ In the end Erasmus is responsible for the first four chapters of *Re-thinking Missions*.

Between Erasmus' *De libero arbitrio* (1524), Luther's *De servo arbitrio* (1525), on the one hand, and Hegel's *Philosophy of Religion* (1832), Kierkegaard's *Entweder-Oder* (1843) and Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre* (1821), on the other hand, about three hundred years intervened. Barth's *Römerbrief* was published in 1919, nearly a hundred years after the *Glaubenslehre*. The period between the Reformers of the sixteenth century and the philosophers, scientists, and theologians of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was unusually fruitful in scientific investigation, philosophic thinking, and the historical study of religions.

The free spirit of the Reformers was bound by the scholastic orthodoxy of both the conforming and the dissenting churches. Christianity was in process of

dissolution through rationalism and in a state of petrification through confessionalism. The humanism of Erasmus, which fell into the background in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, came to its own in the *Aufklärung* of the eighteenth century.

Voltaire, with his keen insight into the spirit of his time, wrote, September 28, 1768: "All over Europe one finds things to astonish one. A revolt of the human mind is taking place which will have far-reaching consequences." Troeltsch, who lived when these "far-reaching consequences" had come, concluded that the modern age in principle began with the eighteenth century instead of the sixteenth, regarding the Reformation as a "medieval phenomenon." The "revolt of the human mind" was against traditionalism in every form, in Church, State, and school. The past was brought before the bar of reason and, unless it could vindicate its claims, was ruthlessly condemned. The study of nature with a free mind contradicted rather than confirmed the creeds and theological systems. The scientific view of the universe, based upon the discoveries of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton, and La Place, was taken for granted by the cultured men of the West. Magellan's circumnavigation of the earth (1519) proved its roundness and the existence of antipodes—both of which were denied on Scriptural and rational grounds. The wide difference between the *Welt-bild* of the Apostles and the Fathers on the one hand, and of the scientists and philosophers on the other, was undeniable and perplexed even conservative Christians. One group gave up the Bible and the confessions and put its trust in reason; the other group refused to follow science and remained loyal to the Bible. Then, as always, there was a mediating party

which was in danger, through compromise, of betraying the Bible and of playing false to science.

Three men of international influence, who represented the century of Frederick the Great, died in the same year, 1778—Hume, Voltaire, Reimarus. Their passing marks the twilight of rationalism and the dawn of a new faith. In England Wesley led the evangelical revival, in France Rousseau was the prophet of romanticism, in Germany Kant, who was awakened from his dogmatic slumbers by Hume and was shown "the deep hidden nature of man"¹² by Rousseau, was preparing his critiques of reason, the results of which he claimed were as significant as the change from the geocentric to the heliocentric view of the universe. At the same time Lessing, Herder, and Goethe were pioneers in propagating a new view of the Bible, of Christianity, of human living, and prepared the way for the idealistic philosophy of Germany—Fichte, Schelling, Hegel.

These men, in the dawn of the Romantic era, were not anti-Christian, as most of the rationalists were; but confessional orthodoxy by no means satisfied them. Sabatier, in his *Religions of Authority and the Religion of the Spirit*, says: "Reimarus, Voltaire, or Tindal [rationalists] had no other idea of religion than Quenstedt or Calov"¹³ [orthodox theologians]. All of them thought it was a series of doctrines and precepts. The one accepted them by authority of revelation, the other by authority of reason. But each assumed himself equally infallible and dogmatic. The sum of the doctrines of orthodoxy was only a little longer than that of rationalism.

The time had come for "rethinking" Christianity in order to deliver it from the bonds of a static orthodoxy

and from the blight of rationalism. The one petrified, the other dissolved it. Men of culture felt the need, in the light of new knowledge and in view of the reassertion of the ability of man to think and to act for himself—the humanism of Enlightenment—for the restoration of the prestige of the Christian religion not only among its “cultivated despisers” but also among its “cultivated” adherents.

For neither the dogmas of the Church nor the conclusions of reason did justice to the content of the Bible or satisfied the mind and heart of men.

Kant in his *Critiques* marks the end of Rationalism and the beginning of Idealism, but he could not restore and commend Christianity. He conserved what the rationalist taught—freedom, God, immortality; but only as postulates of the Practical Reason, which could not be proved by the Pure Reason.

Two men attempted to do what Kant failed to accomplish, Hegel the philosopher and Schleiermacher the theologian. They were colleagues in the University of Berlin, temperamentally diametrical opposites. Both men, though in different ways, were bent upon reconciling philosophy and science with the faith of the Church. They were dissatisfied with the supernaturalism and the naturalism of their day. Both represented the humanistic and the æsthetic view of the world and of life, as Goethe did, and approached God, religion, and Christianity from the side of man—Hegel with the reason through which the Absolute is expressed in thought, and Schleiermacher with feeling through which man becomes conscious of the Absolute. Both were idealistic monists and had a dim sense of the personality of God. Both are immanentists and refrain from an appeal to the supernatural. Later

Schleiermacher grudgingly attempted something akin to the supernatural in the person of Jesus.¹⁴

Thus each sought to deliver men not only from dogmatism and from rationalism but also from philosophic idealism and romantic subjectivism, and to conserve the essence of Christianity in the New Testament. While they paid tribute to Kant, they differed from him in affirming man's ability to know God. Both disregarded the Old Testament; each was an ardent student of Plato and of Spinoza. Schleiermacher through the feeling of absolute dependence was convinced *that* God is; Hegel through thinking claimed to have discovered *what* God is. To him the think is the thing. The value of a religious doctrine depends not on the religious feelings it awakens, but on the truth which it contains. Religion, accordingly, becomes vital to the individual as he appropriates the truth in his feeling and will. As one would expect, Schleiermacher wrote a *psychology* of religion and Hegel a *philosophy* of religion. They were pioneers of philosophic and religious methods which have been followed to the present time; both men were protagonists of continuity, and opposed discontinuity, in nature and in history.

Hegel did not reject the cardinal doctrines of Christianity: the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Church. But he interpreted them in such a way that he took the heart out of them and reduced the realities of the Creeds to abstractions which did not lay hold on men, nor did men lay hold on them. For example, he says: "Christology affirms simply that God comes to be Spirit, and this can take place only in finite spirit, in man; in whom there arises the consciousness of the Absolute, and who then is

likewise the Absolute's consciousness of itself." ¹⁵ According to Professor Caird, Hegel's philosophy was the "complete rejection of ordinary supernaturalism." He had no conception of the otherness of God, of sin and guilt, and of the need of repentance and grace. Man as spirit is in essence identical with the infinite spirit.

He was convinced that his philosophy was in perfect accord with Christianity—an escape for the modern man from a moribund orthodoxy and a barren rationalism. He held that the common good was realized in the State, which he invested with a halo of divinity such as the Oxford movement ascribed to the Church. As Hobbes did in his *Leviathan*, Hegel turned the State into "a mortal God," a procedure in which he was supported by Plato's *Republic*.¹⁶

Kierkegaard, though in his early life an ardent student of Hegel, became his inveterate opponent. Who was Kierkegaard? He has come to his own in our generation, though he lived about a hundred years ago. He was born in Copenhagen, May 5, 1813, and was reared in a home under the influence of his father, in which "a rigorous and uncompromising Christianity prevailed." "When destiny marked him for suffering beyond the common human lot," says E. L. Allen, his biographer, "it did so not so much by the circumstances in which it set him as by the father to whom it gave him." From childhood he was subject to a peculiar kind of melancholy and a type of religion from which he vainly sought deliverance. The father showed the boy Sören pictures bought in a bookseller's shop: among them Napoleon at the head of his conquering army; William Tell shooting the apple from his boy's head; and a man dying, naked and alone, on a cross. The father explained that the man on the

cross was above all others. This is the King of the world Whom the world refused. This is the Son of God Who gave men love, only to receive their hatred in return.

To father and son the earth was the "great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also their Lord was crucified." There and then, by his father's knee, the lad swore that he would avenge the crucified hero. The child proved father of the man. For time came when he desired not to slay those who crucified Him, but to share His cross with Him.

In a posthumously published work, *The Point of View for My Activity as a Writer*, Kierkegaard permits the reader to see into the inmost part of his soul. He says:

From a child I was in the grip of an immense melancholy. . . . I was brought up strictly and seriously in Christianity; humanly speaking, senselessly brought up. . . . [I was] made to feel, think, and live like a melancholy old man! Frightful! What wonder, therefore, if Christianity seemed to me at times like the most inhuman cruelty. Yet I never . . . lost reverence for it, . . . I never broke with Christianity nor gave it up; it never entered my head to attack it—rather was I firmly resolved, so soon as there could be any question at all of the employment of my powers, to offer my all for its defence, or at any rate for the presentation of it in its true colours. . . . So I loved Christianity after a fashion. I revered it; humanly speaking, of course, it had made me extremely unhappy.¹⁷

As the child grew into manhood he passed from one struggle for the higher and the true life to another, from the æsthetic to the ethical and from the ethical

to the religious. "This is the way we must all walk," he wrote in 1837, "over the bridge of sighs into eternity!"¹⁸ He had his moments of deep religious experience when all his fear and dread were submerged beneath a flood-tide of joy. In the same year he passed through a terrific struggle which he describes in the following words: "Then it happened that the great earthquake occurred, the frightful revolution which suddenly forced upon me a new and infallible law for the interpretation of all phenomena."¹⁹

He became engaged to a young woman, Regine, who was "brought up in a respectable Lutheran home whose religion was that of the simple, conventional type." "He, on the other hand, had come to God through the fires of an agonized conscience." Between them there was little in common; they lived in different worlds. They represented two spiritual attitudes—one seeks God in and through the world by what He gives in it; the other finds Him by turning away from the world and all it has to offer.²⁰

After he broke the engagement with Regine, he became dissatisfied with Hegel,²¹ whose philosophy he no longer found harmonized with his experience in his companionship with his father and his fellowship with Regine. Hegel sought God in the inmost sanctuary of the soul, Kierkegaard turned with awe to the divine which came into history in Jesus Christ. Thus he became the apostle of discontinuity and contradicted the prevailing trend of German idealism and all attempts to reconcile Christianity with rationalistic and naturalistic views of the world and of life.

He grew up in the third generation after Goethe and the second generation after Hegel, and lived in an age whose atmosphere was saturated with the ideas of the

poet and of the philosopher. The title of his first book, *Entweder-Oder* (1843), indicates his attitude toward the spiritual order of his time. He was an Either-Or man; not, like Hegel and Schleiermacher, and their host of followers, a Both-And man. The complaint of his contemporaries, "that he would not compromise, that he would not yield," later time has considered a tribute to his memory.²²

He felt that it was his mission "to defend the supernatural against the natural, the transcendence of God against the immanence of the rational philosophers, the personal God against pantheism, to urge the absolute singleness [singularity] of the God-Man, the reality of sin and salvation, and the love of God as opposed to that which men call love, the holiness of God as against the impurity and sentimentality of the 'beautiful soul' of Rousseau." In the fulfilment of this mission he controverted not only Hegelianism but also the State Church of Denmark.

His protest against Hegel is concisely described in a paragraph by E. L. Allen:

The quarrel with Hegelianism lies not in any particular point but in its whole attitude to life and the content of Christianity. The great Christian affirmations appear in it, it is true, but in an emasculated form: a kingly religion, it has lost its authority and continues on its throne by grace of human reason. Instead of the bread of living, concrete truth, we are offered the chilly stone of an abstract speculation, and saving events in time become thin, vague propositions located in a realm of shadows dignified with the name of eternity. It is that "ballet of bloodless categories" of which Mr. F. H. Bradley refused to ask us to become spectators. In such a scheme, "religion" and "faith" are the names given to a sort of general spiritual atmosphere, Christ

is the "speculative unity of God and man," while God himself disappears behind the many-hued splendours of the Absolute. We are "redeemed" when we grasp the truth that sin is but a necessary stage in the self-revelation of Absolute Spirit. In fact, the esoteric knowledge which Hegel communicates turns out to be that everything is "really" something else! ²³

Kierkegaard felt sin to be more than imperfection, ignorance, disease, a "not yet, or a 'necessary stage in the self-revelation of Absolute Spirit.'" It was guilt that could be atoned for only by God—not removed by education, culture, historical development or emergent evolution. The yawning abyss between God and man is bridged only by the love of God. In the preface to *Discourses at Communion Service on Friday* (1851), he writes:

Yet let me add—what in a certain sense is my whole life, its content, its fulness, its peace, and its happiness—that view of life, which is the philosophy of humanity and of human equality: from the Christian point of view every man (the individual), absolutely every man, and once more, absolutely every man is equally near to God. In what sense equally near to God? Because he is loved by Him. And so the equality is there, the absolute equality between man and man. And when there is a difference, that difference is peace itself; undisturbed, it does not disturb the equality . . . O infinite love of God which maketh not distinctions! ²⁴

This love is the self-revelation of God, by nature an offence to human reason, and can only be comprehended by the infinite passion of faith—"the deepest passion, the most audacious and incredible paradox in which the human spirit can be involved."

In the last year of his life he focussed his attack

upon the established Church of Denmark and before long he included Christendom as a whole, particularly Protestantism. The following sentence is taken from one of his tracts, which appeared in rapid succession in the last year of his life:

This must be said, so let it be said. Whoever you are, my friend, and whatever your life may have been, by refusing any longer (if you have hitherto done so) to participate in the public worship as now conducted, with the pretence of being the Christianity of the New Testament, you will have one less crime upon your conscience, and that a heavy one, for you will no longer take part in the mockery of God.

Even when he was at death's door he justified the virulence of his denunciation of the Church and its conventional piety.

His friend Emil Boesen visited him and said that he ought to live longer, so as to retract and soften some of the expressions he had used in the agitation [against the church]. To him Kierkegaard replied: "No, no; you do not understand what you are saying; you think only about earthly things, and have no sense for that which is from above," reminding him of Christ's reply to Peter. "You must remember," he said in another connection, "that I have seen things from the very heart of Christianity, and from that point of view all this [the religiosity of Christianity] is pure marking of time." And in still another conversation with the same friend he tries to give him a simplified impression of the meaning of the whole: "The clergy are royal officials, and officialdom is incommensurable with Christianity. . . . You see, God is sovereign, but then we also have all these human beings who want to live at ease in comfort, and so they give them all Christianity, and thus support a thousand clergymen; nobody in the country can die happy with-

out belonging [to this vested interest]; the consequence is that they become sovereign, and it is all over with God's sovereignty; but He must be obeyed throughout." ²⁵

This all too fragmentary presentation of the attitude of Kierkegaard toward the philosophy of Hegel and the established Church must suffice to show that he was neither a fundamentalist nor a modernist. In this respect he was a forerunner of Barth. Kierkegaard in his own way fought the battle that Barth is now waging. The fundamental thesis of Kierkegaard—"the qualitative difference between eternity and time"—Barth has made the basis of his interpretation of the Bible, his criticism of the Church, and his opposition to the progressive humanizing of Christianity which extends from Schleiermacher to Troeltsch.

Who was Schleiermacher? What Hegel was to Kierkegaard, Schleiermacher and those who, in the language of Troeltsch, accepted Schleiermacher's "great programme of all scientific theology" were to Barth (1886-). The latter, however, came almost a hundred years after Schleiermacher.

He, like Hegel, attempted to define religion so as to conserve the essential and vital elements of Christianity, to win the respect of its cultured despisers, and to harmonize it with "the fairy tales of science and the long results of time." Such a one had to be more than Descartes or Spinoza, Galileo or Newton, Spener or Wesley, Lessing or Herder, Rousseau or Kant. He had to be master of them all and subordinate all of them to the laudable purpose of commending Christianity to those who, in their pride of knowledge, looked upon it with contempt. The one whom God called and man needed for this task was Friedrich Ernst Schleiermacher (1768-1834).

Schleiermacher was prepared by birth and training for his mission in life. His father was a Reformed minister in sympathy with the Moravian spirit. He sent his son to Moravian schools. In his childhood and youth God's grace in the saving of the sinner was brought home to him with the warmth of feeling that characterized Moravian preaching and teaching at that time. It was significant, as far as his later life is concerned, that before his intellect was matured Jesus had won his heart and he thought of religion not as a product of reflection or of moral endeavour but as a blessed feeling of assurance of salvation. He called himself, in his riper years, *ein Herrnhuter höherer Ordnung*.

In his early manhood he passed through a period of doubt and scepticism. He disavowed faith in the Bible and in the historic creeds and confessions. Faith, in the sense of assent to what another person or group thought, became repugnant to him. He bade adieu forever to the supernatural and the miraculous in the Bible and dogma. His negations included angels, demons, and all forms of catastrophic action by which God was supposed now and then to break into the world of time and space.

He not only rejected the authority of the Bible and the confessions in the orthodox sense of that term, but, influenced by Kant's critiques, he denied also the faith of the rationalists. He was convinced that knowledge of the noumenon, *i.e.*, of God, was beyond the reach of the pure reason. All trustworthy knowledge is based upon the experience of phenomena in the sphere of the finite and the temporal. Consequently, he was an agnostic as far as the other-worldly side of God and of man is concerned, *i.e.*, of the Absolute and the im-

mortal. He never got beyond these negations and therefore based his *Glaubenslehre* upon foundations other than the infallible Bible or the equally infallible reason. He refused to be either a rationalistic supernaturalist or a supernatural rationalist.

He was not content, however, with negations. Under the influence of German idealism he reached positive affirmations on the basis of which he defined religion and Christianity—the former in his *Reden*, 1799, and the latter in his *Glaubenslehre*, 1821. Among these convictions, which became the master light of all his seeing, were the following:

First, guided by Kant and Rousseau, Schleiermacher ceased to be philosopher and theologian and turned psychologist, exploring the hidden nature of man and finding the point where God comes in contact with man and man becomes conscious of God. In the feeling of absolute dependence he discovered the seat of religion. Religion is therefore an inseparable part of the soul of man, not something given to man from without, not a remnant of barbarism nor a result of culture.

The second affirmation, through the influence of Plato and of Spinoza, has reference to the relation of God and the world. God is regarded as immanent active power or person, creating continuously the several stages of nature and grace. Thus Schleiermacher superseded the dualism of Deism and of orthodoxy, both of which had in one form or another an absentee God, Who created the universe of law and order, and, when it was finished, contemplated His work from afar; or, if need be, set it right by direct action now and then. Through the idea of immanence, Schleiermacher reconciled his religious thinking with two discoveries of modern science—the reign of law and evolution.

The third affirmation related to the independence of religion from metaphysics and ethics. In the *Reden* he asserts that the devout man, in a passive and receptive state, becomes conscious of God, without effort of reason or will. In the *Glaubenslehre* he joins the dependence with the sense of responsibility. To be devout means to take everything from the hand of God, to put everything under God, and to be led in everything by God. In brief, the feeling of dependence includes not only the sense of gift *from* God but also of task *for* God. What one has received he must give. To do justice to the whole of Schleiermacher's teaching one must consider not only his *Glaubenslehre* but, also, his *Sittenlehre*. The former is based upon the content of Christian experience; the latter upon the question, "What must one do when the God-consciousness of Christ is begotten in him?"

The fourth affirmation relates to the person of Jesus Christ, a historical fact that was beyond the scope of idealistic philosophy. Schleiermacher assumed that he had rediscovered it in Paul and John and in this respect had approached the original doctrine of the Reformers. Yet at this point there is a wide difference between him and Luther. Luther was convinced of sin and grace through the law and the terrors of a guilty conscience. He cried: "*Verloren ohne Christus; selig mit Christus*"—(Lost without Christ; blessed with Christ). Schleiermacher did not share the religious struggle of Paul, Augustine, or Luther. He was a stranger to personal conflict with sin and to the assurance of pardon and peace through the grace of God in Christ.

Here is a contrast of far-reaching significance be-

tween Schleiermacher on the one hand and Luther and Paul on the other. The Reformer and the Apostle were driven to despair by the law and found refuge from the wrath of God in the grace of God. Schleiermacher eliminates the law; justification loses its judicial character and is transformed into regeneration through the impartation of Christ's consciousness of God to men. Then only will men be freed from the world and possess God assuredly and joyously at every moment of their lives.

Schleiermacher was the first theologian who attempted in grand style to put Christ in the centre of a system of doctrine; to put Him in such a form as to be in harmony with natural science and historical criticism, and at the same time to satisfy the demands of Christian faith. He did not consider miracles as an essential of the faith—not even the Virgin Birth or the Resurrection.²⁶ Jesus was Saviour because He was the perfect man who fulfilled the religious ideal in living, in suffering, and in dying. Here he agreed with Erasmus. Christ Himself was the supreme and only miracle. At this point he felt the tension between faith and reason—the identity of the original ideal and the Man of Nazareth, or the possibility of the Absolute incarnate in an individual person. This was his well-known Achilles' heel at which David Friedrich Strauss aimed his deadly shaft in the thesis that the absolute ideal cannot be embodied in a man, but only in humanity. Schleiermacher felt the force of this argument but met it by affirming that the ideal and the real became one in Jesus Christ. He, therefore, regarded Jesus not as emerging out of sinful humanity but as a creative act of God, without however violating historical development or making room for miracles.

Enough has been said to illustrate Schleiermacher's programme, which Troeltsch regards as the programme for the scientific theology of the future. Schleiermacher doubtless did, in his day and in his way, what Paul, Justin Martyr, Origen, Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, and Erasmus did in their day and in their way; that is, he made the laudable attempt to commend Christianity both to its cultured despisers and to its cultured adherents. This now is, and always will be, the task of the theologian. Yet it is questionable whether any theologian can devise a programme and method for theologians to the end of time. When one has the temerity to raise this question, in the face of Troeltsch, one need not for a moment discount the invaluable services Schleiermacher rendered to theology in his generation and in ours. Even Professor Brunner, his most devastating critic, acknowledges the debt that we owe to him. He regards him as "the only great theologian of the past century."²⁷

Schleiermacher was the great creative and constructive genius who sought a foundation for the knowledge of God *in* man rather than *outside* of him—one that all men would have to accept because it is common to all men—the feeling of dependence, in principle not so far removed from Descartes' *cogito, ergo sum*. Here at last he struck bottom rock upon which one could build one's house with assurance; the floods of doubt and scepticism might beat against it in vain. This captivated the modern man perhaps as much as Luther's God of grace won the men of his time. "Schleiermacher's norm for dogmatics therefore is neither the letter of Scripture, nor a symbolical formula, nor a principle of sound reason, but religious feeling, the condition of devout self-

consciousness, by which each doctrinal statement must be approved and in which it must find a sympathetic tone." ²⁸

The controlling principle of Schleiermacher's thinking was the quantitative difference between God and men, eternity and time, the world to come and this world. This amounted to idealistic monism which leaned hard toward pantheism and was congenial to the cultured men of his age. A theology based on these premises must be essentially different from the orthodoxy of the sixteenth century, the thirteenth century, the fifth century in the West, or the fourth century in the East. It was undeniably a *new theology* in harmony with the scientific view of the universe, the new approach to certainty, and the prevalent humanistic spirit.

In short, Schleiermacher, with his new method and programme, broke with the various forms of traditional theology of the preceding centuries, especially with that of the Reformers, Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin. They emphasized the transcendence of God, the sinfulness of man, the incarnation of God, salvation by grace, and revelation through the Bible—*sola gratia, sola fides, solum verbum*. For the Reformers salvation was an act of God; God found man before man found God; God was the certainty and man was the question. At each of these points Schleiermacher differed from his predecessors because his philosophy of immanence left no room for the transcendent God as he is revealed in the Bible. In place of revelation, Schleiermacher put discovery; in place of the word of God, the Christian consciousness; in place of sin, evil, imperfection, a "not-yet."

Clearly, Schleiermacher was both father and child

of the spirit of our time, which Professor Dilthey describes as follows:

The whole conception of life which is at the basis of the Protestant doctrine of justification—the cardinal doctrine of the Reformers, and which includes the all-pervading sense of man's inability to do any good and his submission to the transcendent God and Judge of the world, whose law proceeding from his holiness is directly addressed to man—these are things of the past. Neither a law spoken from above to man nor the doctrine of the justification of the sinner by grace has any meaning for us.

"What then," we ask Professor Dilthey, "remains of the sixteenth century Reform today?" He replies: "Two things: the liberation of men from the bondage of the hierarchy, and the foundation of religious conviction upon one's inner experience." Both of these ideas were in substance accepted by Schleiermacher. Troeltsch and his school acknowledge the truth of Dilthey's statement and are driven, in order to maintain the semblance of historical continuity, to the idea of two kinds of Protestantism—the old and the new. Troeltsch adds a third characteristic of the modern spirit or the new Protestantism, as "the religion of seeking God in one's own feelings, thinking, experience, volition." Witness the recent conversations about God. One, even though a liberal, is a little startled when one reads the following sentence in a book of 1932: "As for God, sin, grace, salvation—the introduction of these ghosts from the dead past one regards as inexcusable, so completely do their unfamiliar presences put us out of countenance, so effectively do they, even under the most favourable circumstances, cramp our style." ²⁹

What is the response to this humanizing and de-Christianizing of Christianity? From 1911 to 1921 an obscure pastor in the village church of Safenwill, in the Canton Aargau, Switzerland, faced a congregation of common people Sunday after Sunday. These people were not "cultured despisers of religion"; they were conscientious seekers for God. They did not want to live by bread alone. They were like the common people in Palestine who loved to hear Jesus. Their minister was educated in the universities of Switzerland and Germany, a pupil of the greatest masters of his time. But with all his knowledge, he knew not what to say to common folks that were anhungered. In despair he turned to the Epistle to the Romans, wrote comments on the margin of his New Testament, found good news from God, and proclaimed it to his congregation; he warmed their hearts, helped them in the struggle for life, sent them away with the courage that is born of faith and hope in the living God. The secret of his power and the power of his conversion was the Word of God; and so he did not argue with, but he fed his flock.³⁰

His marginal comments grew into a volume; and one morning in 1919, Karl Barth, the obscure Swiss pastor, awoke to find himself famous because he found the word of God in the Bible. Eighteen years have elapsed and the books of Barth, Brunner, Gogarten, and Thurneysen are read on two continents. These men did not go *beyond* or *behind* the programme of Schleiermacher; they *abandoned* it and followed new paths. Barth gives a reason for his change of programme.

We had lost the wonder of *God* [he writes], and now we

had to learn to eke out an increasingly difficult and miserable existence by asserting the wonder of the *world*, the miracle of history, and of the inner life (all equally questionable!). The great misery of Protestantism began: doctrine, parted from its life-giving origin, hardened into *Orthodoxy*; Christian experience, confusing itself with this origin, took refuge in *Pietism*; truth, no longer understood and actually no longer understandable, shrivelled into the moral and sentimental maxims of the *Enlightenment*; and finally even Christian experience was reduced in *Schleiermacher* and his followers, both of the left wing and the right, to the hypothesis of being the highest expression of a religious instinct common to all men.³¹

Barth was not primarily concerned about making Christianity palatable to its "cultured despisers." His programme was formulated so as to preach good news from God and about God to publicans and sinners, to common people who feel the need of salvation, to the kind of people for whom the Bible was written, to the kind of people of whom nine-tenths of the world is composed at present. He was on that account opposed, as Professor Brunner observes,³² to the programme of the school of Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Harnack, of Otto and Deissmann, and the religio-psychological school of Chicago or the historico-critical school of Union and Harvard.

Barth puts his estimate of Schleiermacher in the following paragraph:

With all due respect to the genius shown in his work, I can *not* consider Schleiermacher a good teacher in the realm of theology, because, so far as I can see, he is disastrously dim-sighted in regard to the fact that man as man is not only in *need* but beyond all hope of saving himself; that the whole of so-called religion, and not least the Christian

religion, *shares* in this need; and that one can *not* speak of God simply by speaking of man in a loud voice. There are those to whom Schleiermacher's peculiar excellence lies in his having discovered a conception of religion by which he overcame Luther's so-called dualism and connected earth and heaven by a much needed bridge, upon which we may reverently cross.³³

In answer to this specific achievement of Schleiermacher, Barth repeatedly says: "There is no way from man to God, but only from God to man. . . . Even religion, though it is meant as an approach to God, is *not* a way by which we can reach Him. It is a Tower of Babel, testifying only to man's presumptuous and vain desire to 'scale the steep ascent of heaven.'" ³⁴

The first protagonist of the liberals against the teaching of Barth was his distinguished teacher, from whom we all have learned so much, Adolph von Harnack. Mindful of the title of Schleiermacher's *Reden*, he published in *Die Christliche Welt*, January 11, 1922, "Fünfzehn Fragen an die Verächter der wissenschaftlichen Theologie unter den Theologen." In *Die Christliche Welt* of February 8 of the next year, 1923, Barth replied under the caption, "Sechzehn Antworten an Herrn Professor von Harnack." In the introductory paragraph he says:

One who protests against the form of the scientific theology of Protestantism that has developed since Pietism and the Aufklärung, and especially in the last fifty years in Germany as normative (*massgebend*), need not on that account be a despiser of scientific theology. The protest means rather that this theology has departed more than is for the good [of the cause] from the original task set for it by the Reformation.

Barth, when only a young man not yet thirty, dissenting from his teachers, Harnack at Berlin and Herrmann at Marburg, who largely controlled the theological thinking of the last generation in Europe, America, and Asia, reached the defiant conviction that one must find another way of access to God than by logic, historical research, scientific analysis, and moral endeavour. He assumed that God is "the wholly other"—other than man and the world of matter. Man's way to knowledge of God, therefore, must be fundamentally different from the way by which all human knowledge is reached. Revelation and faith must be defined in a new way. Should not theologians courageously affirm that God Himself has said and done something *new*, that cannot be correlated with any or all human words and things. Accordingly, Barth defines faith as "God's work in us apart from all known or unknown organs and functions, and also without any of our so-called experiences of God. For God only can tell us audibly what we cannot hear (I Cor. 2:9)."

This theology recognizes that there is a wide gulf between God's revelation of Himself in His word and all human efforts to find truth—by self-examination, man's knowledge, experience, psychology, historical thinking; these lead us away from God. Civilization and culture are possible apart from God. Trust in the achievements of men implies the abandonment of the righteousness which alone is acceptable to God.

In 1920, two years after the *Römerbrief*, Harnack, about seventy years old, and his pupil Barth, thirty-four years old, met in a students' conference at Aarau, Switzerland. Each listened to the address of the other. The effect on Harnack of Barth's discourse was shattering (*erschütternd*). Not a single sentence, not a

single thought, with which Harnack agreed. In a letter to Eberhard Vischer, he wrote later: "The discourse of Barth loses . . . in my remembrance of it, nothing of its offensiveness; on the contrary, it appears to me to be more questionable and doubtful, yea, in many respects more revolting."

Here not only two men, but two contradictory modes of approach to reality, met. Harnack was in the twilight of one period, Barth in the dawn of another. The shudder of Harnack was felt in theological circles around the world when the *Römerbrief* and other writings of Barth were read in many languages. It may be too early to say who has won the victory—the great teacher or his great pupil. One need not be either prophet or historian to affirm that the viewpoint of Harnack, of the Ritschlian School, and of Troeltsch will not likely be held by the rising generation; one can be quite sure, whether for good or ill, that the spirit of Barth has wrought mightily in men's hearts.³⁵

We come back to the original question, "Was Troeltsch right?" In the wake of Kierkegaard and of Barth one can answer without hesitation, No! Which is the right way, that of Schleiermacher or that of Barth, cannot be answered with a categorical "yes" or "no." The two greatest teachers of mankind, Jesus and Socrates, never answered religious or ethical questions in that way. The issue cannot be finally decided in an evening by a paper and a discussion. Questions of this sort must be answered not so much by arguments in schools as by the wisdom that comes through the discipline of life. Of one thing I am certain, that only an act of omnipotent grace can turn the American philosopher and theologian from the method of

Schleiermacher, Ritschl, and Troeltsch, to the way of Kierkegaard and Barth.

We shall have to keep in mind that Barth's age differs as widely from the age of Schleiermacher as Schleiermacher's age differed from that of Luther and Erasmus. The difference manifests itself in what Professor Whitehead calls climates of opinion. Each climate has its own key words and its own method of approach to the fundamental problems of life.

Professor Carl Becker says:

In the thirteenth century the key words were God, sin, grace, salvation, heaven, and the like; in the nineteenth century, matter, fact, matter of fact, evolution, progress; in the twentieth century, relativity, process, adjustment, function, complex. In the eighteenth century, the words without which no enlightened person could reach a restful conclusion were natural law, first cause, reason, sentiment, humanity, perfectibility.³⁶

Must the minister of the Word and the theologian keep pace with these changing climates of opinion? Must they constantly tear down and build up to conform to the changing fashions of the world? Must they forever, like frightened children, run into the arms of the scientists and philosophers and there find assurance and courage to preach the word of God? Are the ultimate presuppositions of life always changing? Was Aristophanes right when he said: "Whirl is king, having deposed Zeus?"³⁷ Is there an eternal gospel of God?

The evidence of a recent change in one of the primary presuppositions of theology from Schleiermacher to Troeltsch is the loss of confidence in man—in his ability to solve his problems in his own way. In the

Year Book of the American Churches, 1933, the chapter headed "Theology in the United States in 1932" cites two characteristics in theological trends of the current year: 1. "The passing of non-theistic humanism"; and 2. "The mounting distrust of liberal theology."

Unamuno says (and Flaubert in his *Salammbô* confirms it) that in the classic period of Rome men could enjoy the proud consciousness of being supreme in the universe, without any gods above them and without our disturbing knowledge of the beasts below them. Cicero's dictum was characteristic of the time, that, even if there were gods, it were better not to risk any dealings with them.³⁸ At such a time as this Paul wrote the *Römerbrief*—the foolishness of God to confound the wisdom of men.

The humanism of the Renaissance was in principle that of the Roman Cæsars: Man in the pride of power did not deny God or humble himself before Him, but brought God into man's service to exalt man. He achieved this by introducing the notion of the immanence of the divine in man. Referring to the "divine spark" in man which was uncorrupted and without need of salvation—the presupposition of Roman Catholicism, of Erasmian humanism, and of modern liberalism—Professor Brunner says:

This *hybrid*, more than all the practical and moral corruptions, was what they [the Reformers] intended when they spoke of the spirit of Antichrist in Rome. They meant the delusion, prompted by irreverence and presumption, that at least in our inmost part we are not depraved, that somewhere within us God dwells, there is still a point—no, far more than a point!—a psychical area, an experience, a process, where God is man and man is God, where Creator

is creature and the creature is Creator, where our being coalesces with divine being; that there is at least some fragment of human life which is not in need of forgiveness and salvation but simply *is*.

At a time like this Luther, a lonely and unknown monk, wrote comments on the margin of his *Römerbrief*. A revolution broke out that shook the foundations of religion and culture in Western Europe.

The imperialistic humanism of the Cæsars and the æsthetic and aristocratic humanism of the Renaissance were followed by the scientific and democratic humanism of the *Aufklärung*. Instead of declaring war against it, as Luther did against his two antagonists, Eck and Erasmus, Schleiermacher entered into an alliance with it. He discovered God in man and man in God and became the reconciler of all disturbing contradictions. The old theological and Christological controversies now seemed absurd. Why should Augustine quarrel with Pelagius? The differences between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism were of degree, not of kind. The reasons for divisions in Protestantism were no longer cogent. Christianity was one of many religions; indeed, the supreme religion, but not necessarily the only way of salvation. The age-long conflict between revelation and reason, the Bible and science, could easily be resolved by the conception of evolution and the gradual emergence of the content of revelation into the consciousness of man. The harmonization of the Bible and science captivated the modern mind—but the victory may have been won at too great a loss. It ended in “the substitution of modern philosophy and a religion of immanence for Christian faith.” All this was done, of course, with the

highest purpose in response to an irrepressible need; but a hundred years after the *Glaubenslehre*, a village pastor wrote comments on the margin of the *Römerbrief*. We were sailing complacently in our theological crafts toward the haven of human perfectibility when out of a clear sky a storm arose, the waves dashed high, and we were looking anxiously for the clouds to scatter and the waters to calm.

The *Römerbrief* always has been to some an asset, to others a liability. The *Römerbrief* divided the primitive church; Augustine read the *Römerbrief* in the garden in Milan when he decided for Christ; Luther in the tower-room of the monastery saw light breaking through the gloom when he read the *Römerbrief*; Schleiermacher in his own way found help in the *Römerbrief*; Wesley was converted in the Aldersgate Street meeting in London while hearing Luther's introduction to the *Römerbrief*; Barth published his notes on the *Römerbrief* and precipitated a crisis among theologians after the war of the nations.

Perhaps as long as the world stands, when the twilight and chill of evening settle upon the Church, when men expect God to serve them and do not look to God to save them that they may serve Him, men here and there will light their torches, and their hearts will be strangely warmed at the fires that burn in the *Römerbrief*.

FOOTNOTES

¹ I realize that it is not possible in a single lecture to define the position of men like Luther and Erasmus, Kierkegaard and Hegel, Barth and Schleiermacher. My purpose is to show that two approaches to God and two methods of scientific theology have run parallel through the centuries of Christianity. For the section on Hegel and Kierkegaard I am indebted to Allen's *Kierkegaard*, to Haecker's *Sören Kierkegaard*, to Mackintosh's *Types of Modern*

Theology, chaps. II, III, IV, VII, to Kierkegaard's *Philosophical Fragments*, translated with an excellent Introduction by D. F. Swenson. Mackintosh should be read and re-read by every theological student and by the ministers of all the churches.

² R. B. Hoyle, *The Teaching of Karl Barth* (New York: Scribner, 1930), p. 65.

³ Søren Kierkegaard, p. 60.

⁴ Luther, *The Bondage of the Will* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1931), p. 391.

⁵ *Vom Unfreien Willen*; Übersetzung von Justus Jonas, herausgegeben von Friedrich Gogarten, 1924, pp. 3, 18.

⁶ Zwingli, *Opera*, edited by Schuler and Schulthess, VII, 310.

⁷ Luther, *The Bondage of the Will*, English translation, pp. 404-405.

⁸ A. C. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought before Kant* (New York: Scribner, 1911), p. 11.

⁹ Quoted by Troeltsch in *Kultur der Gegenwart*, "Geschichte der Christlichen Religion" (2nd Ed., Berlin and Leipzig, 1909), p. 481.

¹⁰ *Luthers Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit*, p. 157.

¹¹ *Ibid.*

¹² Aristotle, "the irrational part of the soul"; George Fox, "the Inner Light"; the Moravian or Wetterau Pietists, *Der innerste Punkt*, "the inner point."

¹³ P. 202.

¹⁴ See Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 101 f.

¹⁵ Quoted in Mackintosh, *Types of Modern Theology*, p. 110.

¹⁶ See C. C. J. Webb, *A Study of Religious Thought in England from 1850* (Oxford, 1933), p. 146.

¹⁷ E. L. Allen, *Kierkegaard: His Life and Thought* (New York: Harper, 1936), p. 7.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 20.

²⁰ Allen, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

²¹ "It must not be forgotten that Kierkegaard learned and practiced Hegelianism as the child its mother tongue; there was no other philosophy in Copenhagen at that time."—Haecker, *Søren Kierkegaard*, pp. 28-29.

²² Kierkegaard, *Philosophical Fragments*, translated by D. F. Swenson, "Introduction," p. xxx.

²³ *Kierkegaard*, pp. 63-64.

²⁴ Quoted in Haecker, *Søren Kierkegaard*, pp. 51-52.

²⁵ Kierkegaard, *Philosophical Fragments*, "Introduction," p. xxix.

²⁶ See *The Christian Faith*, translated by Mackintosh and Stewart (Edinburgh, 1928), pp. 418-420, 404-406.

²⁷ *Die Mystik und das Wort*, pp. 6, 8.

²⁸ Friedrich Nippold, *Handbuch der neuesten Kirchengeschichte*, Dritter Band: "Geschichte des Protestantismus seit dem deutschen Befreiungskriege," p. 25.

²⁹ Carl Becker, *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (Yale University Press, 1932), p. 48.

³⁰ See Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man* (Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1928), pp. 100-104.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 246.

³² *The Theology of Crisis*, p. 6.

³³ Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, pp. 195-196.

³⁴ Walter Lowrie, *Our Concern with the Theology of Crisis* (Boston: Meador, 1932), pp. 122-123.

³⁵ This section is based on *Adolf von Harnack*, by Agnes von Zahn-Harnack, pp. 525-536.

³⁶ *The Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers*, pp. 9, 47.

³⁷ *The Clouds*, vs. 828.

³⁸ Quoted in Lowrie, *Our Concern with the Theology of Crisis*, p. 145.